BOMBAY COURIER.

Published every Saturday and Tuesday Morning.

VOL. XLI. NUMBER 2049.] TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 1831. [PRICE Rs. 13 PER QUARTER

ADVERTISEMENT.

ON Saturday the 25th Instant at 11 o'clock in the forenoon will be sold by Auction at the Grand Arsenal, Sundry unserviceable Ordnance Stores belonging to the Hon'ble Company, List whereof may be seen at this office. Conditions of the Sale. The lots will be knocked down to the highest bidder, and twenty five per Cent deposit will be required to be paid at the time of sale. The articles then Sold to be paid for and cleared away within four days after the sale, or resold at the risk and expence of the first purchaser.

By Order,
JAMES G. GRIFFITH,
Major Artillery,
and
Senior Commissary of Ordnance.

BOMBAY,
GRAND ARSENAL,
20th June 1831. [555]

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that the Procession of the Taboots will pass from the Bhendy Bazar to the Esplanade on Tuesday next the 21st Inst. on which day, from [illegible] A. M. until 6 P. M. it is recommended [illegible] all persons not concerned in the Mohu[illegible] to refrain from either Riding or Driving along the said Road.

J. D. DEVITRE,
Sen. Mag. of Police.

BOMBAY,
FORT POLICE OFFICE,
17th June, 1831. [557]

NAVAL STORES TO BE SOLD BY AUCTION.

NOTICE is hereby given, that on Wednesday the 22d instant, at eleven o'clock in the Forenoon, there will be disposed of by public sale in the King's Naval yard at this place the following description of Naval Stores, vizt.

One anchor of 17 and one of 7 hundred weight, a quantity of Brass and mixed metal, 70 Iron Barrels, Chain cable of $\frac{7}{8}$ inches Iron, about 16 Chaldron of coals, 2 tons of Copper in Pieces of bolts and old Sheathing; a small quantity of Old Cordage and Canvas, and 5 Tons of Malica Dammer, broken Glass, about 2 Tons of old Iron, and 2 Tons of Lead, 2 Copper measures, 4 cwt. of Ocham, a small quantity of old Steel in worn Saws and Files, a Grinding Stone; 3 anchor stock pieces, and a few losts of Offal wood, &c.

The metal will be sold in lots most convenient to purchasers.

The stores may be viewed four days preceding the day of sale.

Conditions of sale. The lots to be knocked down to the highest bidder, and twenty five per Cent deposit to be paid, at the time of sale, the articles sold to be cleared away within three days after the sale, or be resold at the risk and expence of the bidder.

By order of His Excellency the Naval Commander in Chief.
THOMAS CRAVEN.

H. M. NAVAL YARD,
Bombay, 13*th June*, 1831.
(558)

FRITH BOMANJEE AND CO.—will Sell by Public Auction on Wednesday the 22d June, an assortment of fine Woollen cloths of various colors, Striped and plain Jean, worsted Gown pieces, Shawls of colors, Cotton half hose, Table cutlery, a few bags of American Tobacco, several copies of Blacker's Mahratta war, black lead Pencils, Matchets, Buggy Harness, Beetle nuts, a Dragoon officer's uniform, and a variety of other articles.

AT NOON.

Any horses or cattle that may offer.
[561]

NOTICE.—There are shipped in the Charles Kerr, by Luke Sykes to order 400 Bundles Hoops and 420 Bundles Sheet Iron, which as no one has claimed will be landed at the Custom House, and on payment of landing charges will be delivered on presentation of Bill of lading duly signed. [560]

For Freight or Passage to London.

THE Ship EARL OF ELDON, of 600 Tons, EDWARD THEAKER, commander, will positively sail on the 25th July. This Ship has a poop with excellent accommodations for passengers, and carries a Surgeon. Apply to Captain Theaker or to RITCHIE FINLAY AND CO.

[556] *Bombay, 21st June*, 1831.

HODGSON'S BEER.—For Sale by Public auction, about Fifty Hhds of the above fit for immediate use, will be sold by FRITH BOMANJEE AND CO. on Wednesday, next the 22d Inst. at 1 P. M. at their Rooms.
(562)

NOTICE.—On Thursday the 23d Inst. At one o'clock, there will be sold by Public auction at the Office of Messrs. Adam, Skinner and Co. condemned for sale for the benefit of the concerned, the Hull, Masts, and Rigging, as they now lie on the Beach near Bassein, of the British built Brig Jane Young, Coppered and Copper fastened.

On the same day, if arrived here in time, there will be sold separately the Anchors, Chain, and Hemp cables, Guns, Boats and Rudder, saved from the wreck.
Bombay, 18*th June*, 1831. [559]

ખ ખ ર

તરેશપટવારે•તારીખ ૨૩ મી•ચાલતા• મહીનાનીએ•ઠલાઠ ૧ નાં•મીશીઅરશ• આદમ•ઙશઙીનર • તથા • ક્રુમપનીની • આરીશમાં•અકેર•લીલાંકુ•ઠરીને•વેચશે• જેનુ•પોચતુ•ફોએ•તેનાં•નપા•શાકુ • ૨૬• થએલોછે•વાશતે•વેચશે•તેની • વીગત • અંગારેજનાં•વાવટાની•બાંધેલી • ભરીગ• જેન•ઙઆંગા•તરાંબાની•પ્રરારની•તથા • તરાંબાનાં•ઠપતીલાનીછે•તેનુ• ખોખુ•તથા દોલો•તથા•રીગીનો•એ•શરવે•ફાલ•શ્રી• વશાઙનાં•ઙીનારા•આગલછે ❀

તેજ•દાફાડે•આવી•પોચેઆથી•લંગારો• તથા•શાંઠલ•તથા•શનનો•ફુમાર•તથા • તોપો•તથા•બોતો•તથા•ફ્રુકાન•એ•શરવે ખરાબા•કુપરથી•બચેલુછે•તે•જાકુ•વેચશે —તારીખ ૧૮ મી•જુન ૧૮૩૧ ❀

GENERAL ORDERS.

BY GOVERNMENT.

Bombay Castle, 14 *June* 1831.

By the Right Hon'ble the Governor in Council

No. 244. In conformity with the practice which obtains under the Presidency of Bengal, the Right Hon'ble the Governor in Council is pleased to direct that the issue of sashes to the Non Commissioned Officers of this Army be made quadrennially, instead bienially; and that this rule have effect from the year the last supply was made to the Troops on this Establishment.

Under the above arrangement, the next issue of the article in question will be due with the Clothing for the year 1831.

Bombay Castle, 16*th June* 1831.

No. 245. The Right Honble the Governor in Council directs that the following promotions take place.

Infantry.

Senior Major R. Barnwall to be Lieutenant Col. vice Whitehill deceased. Date of Rank, 10th June 1831

26th Regiment N. I.

Senior Captain M. Soppitt to be Major, and Lieutenant G. Smith, to be Captain in succession to Barnwall promoted. Date of rank, 10th June 1831.

Supernumerary Lieutenant G. Wilson to be admitted on the effective strength from the 10th June 1831 vice Smith promoted.

No. 246. Authentic information having been received of the death of Lieutenant C. A. Hawkins of the 8th Regiment Native Infantry, which took place in England on the 5th May 1830 the following alteration and promotion is made.

8th Regiment Native Infantry.

Lieutenant A. Thomas, admitted on the effective strength from the 6th May 1830 vice C. A. Hawkins, deceased.

Ensign F. Cristall to be Lieutenant vice Levingston promoted. Date of rank, 6th Dec. 1830.

Supernumerary Ensign W. R. Duff to be admitted on the effective strength from the 6th December, 1830, vice Cristall promoted.

No. 247. The rank of Assistant Surgeon Henry Charles Heath, having been received from the Hon'- Court of Directors. Commission is assigned to him from the 21st August 1830 the date of his departure from Europe.

Bombay Castle, 18*th June* 1830.

No. 248. The following appointment is made.

8th Regiment Native Infantry.

Ensign R. W. Horne to be Interpreter in the Maratta language Date of rank, 5th May 1831.

No. 249. Ensign W. Topham of the 7th Regiment Native Infantry has returned to his duty without prejudice to his rank by permission of the Hon'ble the Court of Directors Date of arrival 9th June, 1831.

By Order of the Right Hon'ble the Governor in Council,
C. NORRIS,
Chief Sec.

ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES.

ARRIVALS.

Assist. Surg. John Bourchier M. Est. from Poonah.

Assist. Surg. Patrick Stewart, M. Est. from England.

Lieut. Brabazon Artillery from Do.
Cadet C. Yorke Artillery from Do.
Lieut. D. Malcolm 3d Regt. N. I. from Do.

DEPARTURES.

None.

SHIPPING REPORT.

ARRIVALS.

Do. 17. Ship Good Success, William Durant Master, from China 24th April 1831. Anger 22d May.

Passengers.—Mrs. Durant.

June 18. Barque Discovery, C. E. Rybot Master, returned from Sea.

Do. 19. The Hon'ble Company's Ship General Kyd, Capt. Alexander Nairne, from England Downs 25th January 1831. and St. Helena 28th April 1831.

Passengers.—Mr. Ed. Dallas writer, Mr. Char. Dallas Lt. Bengal Artillery, Mrs. E. Dallas wife of do. Mary Harris Servant of do. Mr. H. T. Brabazon Lt. Bombay Artillery, Mrs. Charlotte Ellis wife of Lt. Ellis H. M. 20th Regt. Miss. Amelia Ellis 8 years, Miss Jane 6 years, John de Silva Native of India 7 Lascars, 8 Chinese proceeding to China.

DEPARTURE.

17. June French Brig La Navarine, B. Guerin Master, to Mauritius.

LIST OF SHIPPING IN THE HARBOUR.

FREE TRADERS.—Universe, Earl of Eldon, Othello.

COUNTRY SHIPS.—Byramgore, Cadery, Maackborn, Sir Charles Malcolm, Dadaloy, Eliza, Dowlet Savoy, Asia Felix, Good Success, Discovery.

ARAB.—Fazarabany, Shahool Mahmud.

HON. COMPANY'S *Receiving Ship*—Hastings.

Do. Do. *Steamer*—Hugh Lindsay.

Do. do. *Brigs of War.*—Nautilus, Euphrates.

Do. Do. *Ship.* Buckinghamshire, Marquis of Huntly, Duke of Sussex, Hythe General Kyd.

PORTUGUESE.—Brig Aurelia.

Do. Do. *Schooner* Royal Tiger.

Do. Do. *Surveying Vessel.*—Benares.

H. M. SHIPS.— Satellite.

FRENCH.- Hebe, Sophie, Adele.

BRAZILIAN.—Amezade.

THE COURIER.

TUESDAY, JUNE 21 1831.

The Hon'ble Company's Ship *General Kyd* Alexander Nairne Esq., arrived on Sunday last from England the 25th January, and St. Helena the 28th April.

Passengers.—Mrs. Dallas, Mrs. Charlotte Ellis, Miss Amelia Ellis, Miss Jane Ellis, Lt. C. Dallas Bengal Artillery, Mr. E. Dallas writer, Lieut. H. T. Brabazon Bombay Artillery, and two Servants, 7 Lascars and 8 Chinese.

We learn by this opportunity that the Caroline from this port, touched at St. Helena and sailed for England on the 11th of March, the Lady Feversham on the 9th of April, the Abberton on the 21st, the Ernest on the 21st, the Preciosa on the 22d, and the Triumph on the 24th of the same month.

We have devoted the largest portion of to day's paper, to the most interesting particulars of the first 4 days debates in the House of Commons, upon Lord John Russel's motion relating to the great question of Reform.

It is almost superfluous to mention that it has become by far the most interesting topic of the day at home; and has absorbed much of the attention which would otherwise have been paid to the state of affairs upon the Continent. The secrecy and expedition which has marked the conduct of ministers upon the occasion, has had the effect of preventing factious opposition; and appears to have excited not only the admiration, but the confidence of almost all classes.

By the proposed Bill all boroughs which contain less than 2000 inhabitants are to be disfranchised; this change condemns 60 boroughs and 119 members.

All boroughs which contain more than 2000, and less than 4000 inhabitants, are in future to return but one member; this will reduce 47 boroughs and 47 members.

Weymouth will in future return two instead of four members.

Seven towns are added to the representation, each to return two members.

Twenty others will each return one member.

The metropolis will in future return eight additional members.

To 27 counties are added two members each.

The Isle of Wight will return one county member.

One member is added to the representation of Wales.

Five members are added to Scotland.

Three members are added to Ireland.

All persons residing in representative towns, and occupying a house of the value of 10l. per. annum, will have a right to a vote at elections for members of towns.

Persons having a right to vote under the present laws will retain it for life. Non-residence, however, is an absolute disqualification in every case.

In the counties, all persons having a right to vote at present, will retain that right.

All persons possessing copyhold, or in Scotland holding the *dominium utile* of land to the amount of 10l. per annum,—and all persons renting property on leases of nineteen years in Scotland, and of twenty-one years in the rest of the empire, of the annual rent of 50l. or more—will be entitled to vote in county elections. Polls in towns to finish in two, in counties in three days.

The addition to the number of electors will be about 500,000 in England; the constituency of Scotland is estimated at 60,000.

Such are the grand outlines of the greatest, wisest, and best measure ever submitted to Parliament. The details of the changes in England will be best understood by the subjoined tables. The following exhibits the names and population (where they have any) of the condemned boroughs. The numbers are taken from the Population Returns of 1821.

Aldborough (York)..	484	Midhurst.....	1335
Aldborough (Suffolk	1212	Milborne Port.....	1440
Appleby	824	Minehead.....	1259
Bedwin	1921	Newport (Cornwall)..	977
Beeralston.....	*	Newton (Lancashire)	1643
Bishop's Castle	1610	Newton (Isle of Wight	
Bletchingly	1187	Okehampton.....	1907
Boroughbridge..	860	Orford.....	1119
Bossiney	877	Petersfield.....	1446
Brackley	1851	Plympton	762
Bramber.....	98	Queenborough.....	881
Buckingham.....	1495	Reigate.....	1328
Callington.....	1321	Romney.....	962
Camelford	1216	St. Mawe's.....	1648
Castle Rising	343	St. Michael's (Cornwell)	*
Corfe Castle.....	823	Saltash	1548
Dunwich.....	200	Sarum (Old).....	*
Eye.....	1882	Seaford.....	1047
Fowey.....	1455	Steyning	1354
Gatton.....	135	Stockbridge.....	715
Halsemere.....	887	Tregony.....	1085
Hedon.....	902	Wareham.....	1931
Heytesbury.....	1323	Wendover..... ..	1602
Higham Ferrers	877	Weobly.....	739
Hindon	880	Whitchurch.....	1434
Ilchester..... ...	802	Winchelsea.....	817
Looe (East).....	770	Woodstock.....	1455
Looe (West).....	539	Wootton Basset ...	1701
Lostwithiel.....	933	Yarmouth (Isle of	
Ludgershall.....	477	Wight...	564
Malmesbury	1322		

The reduced boroughs are these,

Amersham.....	2612	Lymington.....	3164
Arundel.....	2511	Maldon.....	3198
Ashburton.....	3403	Marlborough	3033
Brewdly.....	3715	Marlow.....	2632
Bodmin.....	2902	Morpeth.....	2415
Bridport.....	5742	Northallerton.....	2626
Chippenham.....	3201	Penryn.....	2933
Clitheroe.....	326	Richmond.....	3546
Cockermouth.....	3790	Rye.....	5599
Dorchester..... ..	2743	St Germains.....	2404
Downton.....	3114	St. Ives	3526
Droitwich...	2176	Sandwich....	2912
Evesham.....	3487	Sudbury.....	2115
Grimsby.....	3064	Shaftesbury.....	2743
Grinstead (East).....	3153	Tamworth.....	1636
Guildford.....	3161	Thetford.....	2922
Helston.....	2671	Thirsk.....	2533
Honiton.....	3296	Totness.....	3128
Huntingdon.....	2805	Truro.....	2712
Hythe.....	2185	Wallingford.....	2093
Launceston.....	2183	Westbury.....	2117
Leominster.....	3651	Wilton.....	3058
Liskeard	2423	Wycombe.....	2864
Lyme Regis.....	2269	Weymouth	

The added towns, which will in future return two members each, are

Manchaster	108,016		Woolverhampton.....	36,838	
Salford.....	25,772		Bilston....	12,003	
		133,788	Sedgeley..	17,195	
Birmingham	85,416				66,036
Ashton....	19,189		Sheffield.....		62,105
		104,605			
Leeds.....		83,196	Sunderland..	14,725	
Deptford..	19,862		Bishop Wearmouth ...	11,542	
Greenwich..	20,712		Monk Wearmouth....	7,644	
Woolwich..	17,008				33,911
		56,582			

* There is some error in the lists here, but we have not the means of correcting.

The added towns, which will in future return one member, are

Brighton.....	24,429	Whiteheaven	12,438
Blackburn.....	53,350	Workington	7,188
Wolverhampton....	36,828	Harrington..	1,845
Macclesfields.....	17,746		21,471
South Shields	8,885	Dudley.....	18,211
Westoe....	7,618	Tynemouth	9,454
	16,503	North Shields	8,205
Warrington.....	16,698		17,659
Huddersfield.....	24,220	Cheltenham.....	13,396
Halifax.....	92,850	Bradford (Wilts)....	10,231
Gateshead.....	11,767	Frome.....	12,411
Kendal.....	17,417	Wakefield.....	22,307
Bolton.....	50,197	Kidderminster.....	15,294
Stockport.....	44,957		

London Districts to return two each.

Tower Hamlets....	283,000	Finsbury.....	162,000
Holborn.....	218,000	Lambeth.....	128,000

The counties, which will in future return four instead of two members—except Yorkshire which will return six—are,

Chester.....	270,098	Shropshire.....	204,153
Cornwall.....	257,447	Somersetshire.....	355,314
Cumberland.....	156,124	Southampton.....	289,298
Derby.....	213,333	Stafford.....	341,040
Devon.....	439,040	Suffolk.....	270,542
Durham.....	207,473	Surry.....	398,658
Essex.....	289,424	Sussex.....	233,019
Gloucester.....	335,843	Warwickshire.....	274,392
Kent.....	424,014	Wiltshire.....	222,157
Lancaster.....	1,052,859	Worcestershire.....	184,424
Leicester.....	174,571	Yorkshire, East	
Lincoln.....	283 058	Riding	190,449
Northampton.....	162,483	" " North Riding.	183,381
Northumberland....	198,965	" " West Riding..	799,357
Norfolk.....	344,348	Isle of Wight... ...	31,616
Nottingham.....	186,873		

In Wales, Swansea and some towns in its neighbourhood are erected into an elective district.

In Scotland, Edinburgh will, in future, return two members, Glasgow two; and Aberdeen, Paisley, Dundee, Greenock, Leith (including

* The boroughs of old Sarum, Beerelston, St, Michael's, and Newton (Isle of Wight) are included in other parishes. They are not distinguished in the Population Return.

Port bello and Musselburgh), will return one member; Dumbarton will be joined to Bute, and Peebles to Selkirk, in addition to the conjunctions already existing, and Peterhead will come instead of Aberdeen. The Anstruther district of boroughs will be disfranchised. The voting will take place in the head town of each district, without delegation. The bill will disfranchise all the present burgh voters, except such as may have the new qualification. Of course, the municipal government is not affected by it.

The alterations in Ireland are one member added to Belfast, one to Waterford, and one to Limerick.

The result of the whole changes will be a diminution of 71 members in England. The House now consists of 658 members; it will in future consist of 596.

The first striking feature of the Ministerial plan, is the attempt, for the first time since the foundation of the monarchy, to connect the Parliament in strict and intimate union with the great mass of the intelligence and property of the kingdom—to give stability to the constitution, not by a mere widening of the bases on which it rests, but by substituting for the rotten and unequal piles by which it has hithereto been propped rather than supported, the good sound heart of oak of Old England—the man of sense and substance, from the decent, thrifty shopkeeper, up to the merchant and landowner of a hundred thousand a year. It is a plan which must succeed.

The second striking feature of the plan is its simplicity. Instead of the thousand confused, unintelligible, often unknown, always undetermined franchises at present existing, it offers an easily intelligible test for the voters in towns and in counties respectively all over the kingdom. The consequence will be, the reduction of expense, the abolition of vexatious and harassing disputes, the removal of riots, drunkenness, and tumults, the introducing into the election of a member of the Legislature all that decency and deliberation which are so fitting in an act of so high importance.

The interest which the measure has excited it is needless to comment on, for which of the whole number of our readers does not feel its intensity? On the House it seemed to burst like a thunder-clap. So well had Ministers kept their secret, that up to six o'clock on Tuesday—up even to the moment when Lord John Russell having ended his exordium, actually announced the details of the measure, there did not appear to be a single soul that anticipated what these details were to be.

The House of Commons was crammed—so much so, that the members could not find sitting-room. The Speaker declared he had never witnessed such an attendance. We need not describe the gallery: the passages were crowded with anxious expectants—barriers even were found necessary to protect the members from the pressure of the crowd in passing into the House.

The speech of Lord John Russell was distinguished for its plainness, simplicity, and for the absence of every thing like an attempt at mere effect. The motion which he made, and which the House has been occupied in discussing for four nights, and will perhaps discuss for other four, was—"For leave to bring in a bill to amend the state of the representation in England and Wales." The representation of Scotland, and that of Ireland, will form the subject of two separate bills.

It is unnecessary to allude to the various speakers. We have thought it our duty to assign to them a space in our columns which nothing but the immense importance of the subject could have justified. Arguments against the bill are not very new, nor will they prove very convincing. There is little fear that a cause which is opposed by no stronger weapons than the popularity of Sir Robert Peel, the modesty of Mr. Croker, the learning of Sir Robert Harry Inglis, the discrimination of Sir Charles Wetherell, and the gentility of Mr. Horace Twiss, should seriously suffer in the eyes of men of sense, honour, or honesty. It was hinted to Earl Grey the other day, by a milk-and-water politician, that the bill would not pass. "What!" said the veteran, "not pass? A bill which is approved of by the King, which is recommended by the Government, which is accepted by the People of England!—It must, and it shall pass."

Lord JOHN RUSSELL said, he rose with feelings of the deepest anxiety to bring forward a measure as unparelleled in importance as in difficulties. The measure was not individually his, but that of the Government in whose name he appeared—the deliberate measure of the whole Cabinet—the redemption of the solemn pledge they had given to their Sovereign, to Parliament, and to their country. The interest that attached to the subject was shown by the crowded audience assembled there, but still more by the deep interest felt by millions out of the House, who looked with anxiety, with hope, and expectation to the result of that day's debate. His Lordship attributed the authorship of the measure to Earl Grey; and then proceeded to observe upon a cavil which had been raised upon an expression of the noble Earl—"that he would endeavour to frame such a measure as would satisfy the public mind, without endangering the settled institutions of the country." Some persons had said that the *rotten boroughs* were part of the settled institutions of the country; but the noble Earl did not mean to include them in the above expression. "But can you," said this party," pretend to satisfy the public mind without shaking the settled institutions of the country?" His Lordship thought that the danger was involved rather in not attempting to satisfy the public mind. These institutions rested upon the confidence and love of Englishmen. The Government desired not to comply with extravagant demands, out to bring forward a measure which every reasonable man would wish to become a law. The Government wished to place itself between two hostile parties—those who assert that no reform is necessary, and those who declare that one particular reform only will satisfy the people. They placed themselves between the abuses they wished to amend and the convulsion they hoped to avert.

His Lordship then proceeded to state the case of the Reformers.

The ancient constitution of our country declares, that no man shall be taxed for the support of the state, who has not by himself or his representative consented to the imposition of the tax. The well-known statute *de tallagio non concedendo* repeated the same language. It included all the freemen of the land; and provided that each country should send to the Commons of the realm two knights, each city two burgesses, and each borough two members. Thus, about a hundred places sent representatives, and some thirty or forty others occasionally enjoyed the previlege; but it was discontinued or revived as they rose or fell in the scale of importance. At that early period the House of Commons did represent the people of England. The House of Commons does not now represent the people of England. (*Noise.*) Therefore if we look to the question of right, the Reformers have right in their favour.

His Lordship declared it impossible to preserve the House of Commons in its present state.

Suppose a foreigner were told that in this most wealthy, most civilized, most free country, the guardians of her rights were chosen every six years, would he not be curious to hear in what way this great and wise nation selected its representatives? Would he not be astonished to learn, that a green mound, or that a park without the vestige of a dwelling, sent two members to Parliament? Still more would he be astonished if carried into the North, he should see large, flourishing towns, full of trade and activity, vast magazines of wealth and manufactures, and were told that those places sent no members to Parliament. Would he not be astonished to witness in a popular election (as at Liverpool) the most barefaced scenes of bribery and corruption? Would he not be surprised, that representatives so chosen could perform the functions of a legislature? "I say, then, if we appeal to reason, the Reformers have reason on their side. Our opponents may say," We agree that in point of right the House of Commons does not represent the people, and in point of reason nothing can be more absurd; but Government is a matter of practice and worldly wisdom, and as long as the House of Commons enjoys the respect of the people, it would be unwise to change." This argument has much weight, and as long as the people did not answer the appeals of the friends of reform, I felt that it was not to be resisted. But now the whole people call loudly for reform. (*Noises.*) The confidence of the people in this House exists no longer. (*Noises.*) I will say, it would be easier to transfer the flourishing manufacture of Leeds and Manchester to Gatton and Old Sarum, than to reestablish confidence and sympathy between the House and those whom it calls its constituents. Therefore, I say, if this question be one of right, right is in favour of reform; if it be a question of reason, reason is in favour of reform; if it be a question of policy and expediency, policy and expediency are in favour of reform. (*Loud cheers.*)

The Ministers thought, continued his Lordship, that it would not be sufficient to propose a measure which should merely lop off some excrescences, or cure some notorious defects, but would still leave the battle to be fought hereafter; that no half-measures would be sufficient—no trifling, no paltering with reform, could give stability to the Crown, strength to the Parliament, or satisfaction to the country. (*Much cheering.*) The people complained of the nomination of members by individuals, of the elections by close corporations, and of the expenses of elections. The nomination by individuals might be effected in one of two ways—either over a place containing scarcely any inhabitants, and with a very extensive right of election, or over a place of wide extent and numerous population, but where the franchise is confined to very few residents. Gatton was an example of the first, Bath of the second. A remedy had been applied to both. In boroughs, where the inhabitants were few, and the franchise extensive, it would be a mere farce to take away the right from the persons and give it to the borough. The only remedy was to disfranchise the borough. He was aware that this was a bold and decisive measure, and that on all ordinary occasions rights of this kind ought to be respected—for no small consideration should they be touched. Lord John proceeded to quote the precedent of the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders of Ireland, when the Catholic Emancipation Bill passed.

That bill was accompanied by another measure—the disfranchisement of 200,000 freeholders—who had broken no law, corrupted no right, but exercised their privilege, ignorantly perhaps, but independently, and according to the best light they could obtain from their consciences. "Now if I am about to quote the words of the right honourable gentlemen (Sir Robert Peel), it is not because he was bound to be consistent. (*Cheers and Laughter.*) On great occasions of this kind, men must act as the interests of the country demand. But I beg the House to recollect, that he stood here as the servant of the Crown—representing the Ministers who have gone out of office—and declaring in their name, the principles which ought to bind Parliament in the decision of a great question at an important crisis. He told us that on fit occasions the House was bound to step beyond its ordinary rules—that it did so on the discussion of the Union, the Septennial Acts, and some others. Shall we say that this principle is to be maintained when the poor peasantry of Ireland is concerned, but not so when it touches the great and the wealthy? Shall we at once deprive the freeholder of Ireland of the right which he merely exercised as the constitution gave to him, and be afraid to touch the right of the noble proprietor of Gatton, who returns two members to Parliament, although he derived no such power from the constitution? Shall a strictly constitutional right be abolished because the convenience, the necessity of the country demands it, and that a right, which is a mere usurpation, with no sanction of law, and supported only by usage, shall be represented and untouched, though the public interest requires, and the public voice demands its abolition? Shall we make this glaring distinction between rich and poor, high and low—disfranchise the peasant, and prop the falling fortunes of the peer?" (*Hear. hear!*)

His Lordship said, it had been a point of great difficulty to decide to whom the franchise should be extended. In ancient times, every inhabitant householder resident in borough was competent to vote for members of Parliament. This arrangement excluding villeins and strangers, the right belonged to particular persons in every town, who were persons of property; they in fact paid the subsides and taxes. In some towns every person possessing a house was admitted to participate in the privileges formerly possessed by burgesses; in others, bugesses became a select body, more or less exclusive of the inhabitants. These differences led to the complicated questions of right, which the House was every week called upon to decide—questions most vexatious and difficult, and at the same time most useless. Originally, these questions were decided by the prevalence of one party or the other; they were now determined fairly, but still the determinations were founded upon the iniquity of the parties. His Lordship contended, that the House ought to get rid of these complicated and vexatious questions, and give the right of voting to the real property and real respectability of the cities and towns.

In speaking of the 168 vacancies to be created by the disfranchisement of the boroughs, Lord John Russell said, that the Government thought it inexpedient to fill up the whole of them. The number of members at present was inconveniently large. (*Cheers and laughter.*) No gentleman who had been a member of the House before the Union with Ireland would deny that the facility of getting through business had been since greatly diminished.

"Besides," said his lordship, "when Parliament is reformed, so many members will not enter Parliament merely for the sake of the name, and as a matter of style and fashion. (*Murmurs.*) Some members spend their money in foreign countries, and never attend the House at all. At the end of a Parliament, there are generally found some instances of individuals who have been elected, but have never appeared at the table of the House even to take the oaths. But when constituents watch the actions and the votes of their members, their attendance will be more regular.

His Lordship then gave the details of the measure, which we have already stated. Speaking of the increase in the constituency of the empire consequent on the bill, Lord John said—

He calculated that the number which would be added to the constituency would certainly be half a million of people, and of people, too, who would be connected with the property of the country, having themselves a valuable stake in the country, deeply interested in preserving and promoting its interests, and upon whom they could depend in any future struggle which the country might have to sustain to support that House--to support Parliament, and to support the Throne, in bringing that struggle to a successful terminatiou. (*Loud and repeated cheers.*) He thought that such a measure was calculated to give the greatest possible incitement to industry and good conduct throughout the great body of the electors in the United Kingdom. When a man found that he was rated for a certain amount, and that that rate gave to him the privilege of voting for a representative in Parliament, it would be evidently both prudent and politic on his part to preserve his character unimpaired amongst his neighbours and in the face of the country. He was of opinion that when they added such a large constituency to the country, they provided both for its moral and political improvement.

Two questions the bill left untouched--the duration of Parliament, and the vote by ballot. With respect to the first, granting the difficulty to be no mean one of fixing what period should be long enough to enable members to be fully acquainted with the duties they had to perform, and at the same time not so long as to remove them from the salutary control of their constituents, his Lordship yet thought it could be best settled by a future and separate enactment. With respect to the vote by ballot, he admitted that few questions came backed by stronger and more convincing arguments; at the same time, he could not say they had convinced him. The ballot went to establish a system of irresponsibility; and he was not friendly to the existence in the constitution of any body, electors or others, who should be wholly irresponsible for the manner in which they exercised their political privileges.

The objection usually urged against such a measure as he then brought forward, was, that it went to alter what had been rendered venerable by time: but he must contend, that they would pay a much higher compliment to the wisdom of our ancestors, by removing than by perpetuating the abuses which vitiated the system of which they were in their wisdom the founders. Thus it had been said, that if close boroughs were disfranchised, men of talents only might not be able to find their way into the House of commons; and examples were brought forward of many men of talents who had commenced their Parliamentary career as representatives of close boroughs. Lord John ridiculed the notion that under a popular system of election talent and probity would not have more weight then under a restricted system. It was said that a House of Commons, chosen as he would have it chosen, would be wholly democratical—that such a plan would be fatal to the aristocracy of the country--

He utterly denied that his plan could have any such effect. Wherever the aristocracy resided, receiving large incomes, performing important duties, relieving the poor by charity, and evincing private worth and public virtues in their attention to the neighbourhood around them, it was not in human nature that they should not possess a great influence upon public opinion, and have an equal weight in electing persons to serve their country in Parliament. (Hear, hear!) Although such an aristocracy might not, under a system of reform, possess the influence which they now enjoyed, he felt assured that they would have as much influence as they ought to have in electing the members of that House, and fully as much as the constitution ever intended that they should have. But if the effect of this measure were only to destroy the influence of an aristocracy that did not live with the people or for the people, that knew nothing of the people, that cared nothing for the people—an aristocracy that sought for honours without desert, that craved for places without duties, and for pensions without service—for such an aristocracy he had no respect and no sympathy, and the destruction of their influence would be one of the most powerful arguments that could be urged in his favour. (*Loud and repeated cheers.*)

The question, however, was not whether reform should exclude here or there an unlucky man of talents—not whether it might detract from the influence of this or that lord; it was,

Whether, without some large measure of reform, the Government could carry on the affairs of the country with the confidence and support of the nation. If this could not be done, it might still become a question whether reform could be resisted, but their could be no question that in such a case the British constitution must perish. (*Noises.*) The House of Commons in its unreformed state had nothing to look to but public confidence, and the sympathy of the nation, for its support. It appeared to him that if reform were refused, all such confidence and sympathy would very soon be withheld. (*Noises.*) He asked whether, when the Ministers of the Crown were convinced that reform was necessary—when the Sovereign had permitted them to lay before the House their proposition; and when they came, with that permission, to declare in the most firm and unequivocal manner, that they considered reform to be indispensable, and when the people out of doors, by multitudes of petitions, and millions of voices, were calling for the same thing—was it for the House of Commons to say—"We are the judges of our own purity; we equally despise the Ministers of the Crown and the voice of the people. We will keep our power against all remonstrances and all petitions, and we will take our chance of the dreadful consequences?"

Whatever might be the result of the propositions he had made to the House, he must say that his Majesty's Ministers would feel that they had thoroughly done their duty in bringing the measure forward. (*Cheers.*) His Majesty's Ministers had persued the strict line of their duty, and had followed a straightforward course, neither seeking for the support of particular classes, nor the applause of the multitude. When they had felt it to be their duty to resist popular feelings, they had not hesitated to encounter and resist them by a firm and vigorous enforcement of the law, by which many disturbances had been prevented, and many in other parts of England had been suppressed, he trusted permanently. By their vigorously enforcing laws, passed before they had entered into office, agitation had been made to subside, and peace had been re-established. In no case could it be said that Ministers had wavered in their duty by bending to popular clamour, or by stooping to ingratiate themselves in popular and transient favour. He had a right to say, that in submitting the present proposition to the House, they had evinced an interest in the future welfare of the country. They had thought that what they had proposed was the only thing calculated to give permanence to the constitution which had so long been the admiration of foreign nations on account of its free and popular spirit, but which could not exist much longer, except by the infusion of a new popular spirit. By these means, the House would show to the world that it was determined no longer to be an assembly of the representatives of small classes and particular interests, but that it was resolved to form a body of men who represented the people—who sprung from the people, who had sympathies with the people, and could fairly call upon the people to support their burdens in the future struggles and difficulties of the country, on the ground that those who asked them for that support were joining heart and hand with them, and like themselves were seeking only the glory and welfare of England.

Lord John Russell concluded by moving for leave to bring in a bill in conformity with the propositions laid down in his speech.

Mr. HUME moved the adjournment on Tuesday; and, by the courtesy of the House, he opened the renewed debate on Wednesday. Radical reformer as he was, Mr. Hume said, was bound to admit, that the plan of Ref

Digitized with financial assistance from the Government of Maharashtra on 08 April, 2017

exceeded his expectations. With every disposition to give confidence to the Ministers, he had not been prepared for so manly and bold a measure. It efficiently redeemed the pledge of Ministers. Any change from bad to good,—or rather, in this case, from the worst to the best,—must be attended with difficulty; but it would be the duty of every man, instead of throwing petty obstacles in the way of the plan, to do his utmost to promote so great and good an object. He was glad that Ministers had not encumbered themselves with the Ballot and Triennial Parliaments: these should be postponed, at any rate, till the present important changes had been accomplished. It was with satisfaction he stated, that all the persons with whom he had had the opportunity of conversing that day, highly approved of the plan. (*Cheers.*) Many of these were among the strongest Reformers in England. And it was wise to be satisfied. It was the perfection of government to meet the growing wishes of the people, and, by timely changes, to avoid the risk of more violent changes. Perhaps some would think that the qualification of an elector was placed too high, because it excluded so many of the lowers orders; but he believed the great mass of the community would see at once the great good that had been achieved, and the little injury with which it was attended. The parties who would be chiefly benefitted would be the lowest and highest classes—the people and the peers—for population and property were made the two foundations of the franchise. The speeches of Lord Leveson Gower and Mr. Twiss were not so much against any specific plan of Reform, as against Reform in the abstract. He put it to the House, whether it could be seriously asserted that it did not need Reform. (*Noise.*) The noble Lord had talked of the prosperity of Scotland, as if it had arisen out of the defective state of the representation. True Scotland had thriven, but her prosperity had grown out of her connexions with England, a rich manufacturing country: and if her system of elections had been different, her prosperity might have been greater. Scotland had raised her voice for Reform. She would have the satisfaction of knowing that the number of her electors would be increased from three thousand to six thousand. Mr. Hume approved of the plan of reducing the number of members; he thought no deliberative assembly should exceed five hundred members. He was anxious to say, that every argument advanced last night against the measure seemed to him the strongest possible argument for its adoption at the present moment. Did the House possess the confidence of the people? In the face of the petitions from all parts of the kingdom and from all classes of the community, no member would venture to say it did. Was it not wise, then, to comply with reasonable wishes rationally urged instead of waiting for the compulsion of a more violent ebullition! The recent violent changes on the Continent had been produced by the obstinate refusal of Government to listen to the voice of the people. Let any man who opposed this beneficial change, think what might be the consequence of its rejection.

Lord EBRINGTON felt it incumbent on him to return the thanks of his constituents to his noble friend, the proposer of the bill, to that united cabinet which had deputed his noble friend, to propose the measure, and to that gracious Master who had given his sanction to the proposition. (*Loud cheering and cries of "Order" from the Opposition.*)

A member appeared to the Speaker, whether such an allusion to the sentimements of the Sovereign were not most disorderly.

The SPEAKER had no difficulty in answering, that nothing could be more disorderly than to introduce the name of the Sovereign for the purpose of influencing the House in its (judgment and decision upon a public measure. *cheers from the Opposition.*) But if the name of the Sovereign were alluded to merely with a view to state to the House what the House knew well to be the case—that, by the constitution of the country, Ministers being alone responsible and answerable for public measures, the presumption was that the Sovereign, having the right and prerogative to change his servants, would not continue them in office if they proposed measures that were not considered beneficial to the country, the allusion was not disorderly, (*Cheers from the Ministerial benches.*)

Lord EBRINGTON went on to repeat, that he felt it his duty to offer to the Ministers of the Crown the thanks of his constituents, as well as his own thanks, for the measure which they had proposed to the House,—thanks for this great and comprehensive and safe, because efficient and full, measure of Parliamentary Reform (*Cheers and (laughter from the Opposition.*) Lord Ebrington said the defence of the rotten boroughs that had been attempted went too far: the argument went to show, not merely that the members for Old Sarum and Gatton were as good as other members, but they were much better (*Laughter.*) The effect of such reasoning if pushed to its full length would be to show that in order to have the country well governed, and the public business well done, the House ought to consist entirely of representatives without constituents,- entirely of members for Old Sarums and Gattons. (*Laughter.*) He had no intention of giving up opinions deliberately formed on subjects not contemplated in the bill; but he should consider himself the worst of Reformers if he offered to press at this moment any question, such as the ballot, which might have the slightest tendency to embarrass Ministers on this great and healing measure. The passing of the bill would restore sympathy between the people and the House of Commons; it rejection would widen the breach to an extent that he dreaded to contemplate. (*Cheers from the Treasury side and cries of "No" from the Opposition.*) Sure he was, that if his noble friend's measure were not carried; the confidence of the country would be altogether withdrawn from parliament (*Noise.*)

LORD STORMONT, Member for Aldborough, characterized the bill as a Budget of Reform—he could find no name for it in the dictionary, but that which was in common language given to financial statements, of which Lord Althorpe had a few nights before favoured them with so curious a specimen. Lord Stormont complained greatly of the system of intimidation which was pursued by ministers and their supporters. At one time, the House was sought to be compelled into a vote for the bill, because the Sovereign was favourable to it, and at another because the people demanded it.

The call to comply with the "demands" or with the "just grievances" of the people, Lord Stormont said, was so correspondent to the language put by Shakspeare into the mouth of *Coriolanus*, that he could almost fancy the great dramatist had foreseen the day—a dreadful day of England—when it was to be enforced, as it had been the previous evening, by the authority of Government. The language of the plebeians of Rome was.

"We did request it?
We are the greater poll, and in true fear,
They gave us our demands."

To such an argument Lord Stormont, as *Coriolanus*, would answer.—

Thus we debase,
The nature of our seats, and make the rabble
Call our cares fears, which will in time break open
The locks o' the senate, and bring in the crows
To peck the eagles."

What did the bill propose;

To disfranchise an immense number of boroughs. The borough which he represented was surrounded by walls; the walls indeed had crumbled away, but within these walls, and there only, the electors were entitled to vote. The extent of these walls proved very clearly, that a much greater number of voters existed there formerly than possessed the elective franchise in that borough at present. Now he could see no reason why the rights which had been so long enjoyed by those individuals should be interfered with. The proposition of the noble Lord would have the effect of consigning to civil death a great number of those who now had seats in that House; and he did not think that the noble Lord would easily find 168 members in the House, or any where else, who would be willing however plausible the arguments which might be urged, to vote their own damnation (*Laughter*)

With respect to Scotland, Lord Stormont begged to say a very few words.

The wish of Ministers seemed to be, to establish a popular representation there. Now when the Scotch representation was adapted to that of England, it never was intended to be a popular representation. (*Laughter,*) It was intended to be a representation of the land, and the owners of the land. The petitions from Scotland prayed for the right of returning members to parliament for each county. But what had the noble Lord done! Why, he had jumbled county into county, and this he called complying with the prayer of the petitioners. He could assure the noble Lord, that the people of Scotland would be much better pleased if they were left alone with their ancient rights and privil ges. They would be far more content with their old institutions than with new ones that were founded on untried theory. He was not one of those who were opposed to a measure of reform, merely because it was a measure of reform; but when he compared the present motion with what had been brought forward year after year, he could not help thinking, that if he understood the plan rightly, reform would be revolution—possession would be spoliation, and sooner or later, religion would be atheism.

MR. MACAULEY defended the proposition of Ministers at great length, and in a speech of singular power and brilliancy.

He thought it a wise, noble, and effective measure, skillfully arranged for the purpose for which it was intended, and calculated to unite and link together all orders in the country. Sir John Walsh had said, that it contained two incongruous principles. On the contrary it appeared to him to contain but one principle—that it was desirable to give a share in the representation to the middle classes of the British people, and to do this by a change as little violent as possible to the present institutions of the country. It had also been said that the act ought to have been symmetrical in its form of representation; but, in his opinion, it was wise not to make it symmetrical—it was wise in keeping the counties and the towns distinct—it was wise, because a measure had been taken which would give due weight to the middle classes of the people, without producing any convulsive change. He did not pretend to say that the same institution would suit every country. (*Laughter.*) Some nations were so happy that the best elective franchise for them was universal suffrage. Such was his opinion; for he conceived that if all the labouring classes of England were fully employed, and their wages high, with reason for believing that their feeling would extend to all classes of the community, and be lasting in their effect, then the whole body might be intrusted with the ellective franchise, for it was known that the American people used that advantage well, and he did not believe that either in head or heart they were superior to the English people. (*Cheers.*) But as the case now stood with this country, the body of the labouring classes was reduced to a state of considerable distress; and they all knew what effect distress had on the minds of people even better educated and of sounder judgments than the labouring classes. Distress made men credulous and irritable; and on that ground, principally, he never could consent to any extension of suffrage of which property was not to be the basis. He supported this measure because he looked with horror on revolution; and he supported it because he believed that it was the best security against revolution

In answer to the charge of intimidation, Mr. Macaaley said, he did not think that any had been used.

When Lord Castlereagh had come down to that House and enforced his proposition for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, by alluding to the possibility of popular tumults arising—when he had enforced his arguments in favour of the Six Acts, by the same observation no one then thought of assuming that a reference to the possibility of such an occurrence was either threat or intimidation. So he referred to the present state of the country as a reason for granting Reform; he did not refer to it as a threat. He felt great alarm for the fate of the country, which would be endangered, he would not say if this measure were rejected, but unless some similar measure were passed. He did not threaten the House, but was discharging his duty to his country and to the House, in stating soberly as a reason, and not as a threat his firm and sincere conviction, that unless some measure were adopted for admitting the middle classes to an effective share of the representation, the institutions of this country would be exposed to great danger. He supported the measure, not merely as a measure of Reform, but as a measure of conservation. If the House wished to exclude revolution, this measure was necessary, and it must be adopted as a means of safety for a desired end. If it was said that property and intelligence, were the bases of a representative Government—that it was only by means of intelligence and by means of property that such a government could be preserved—if property and intelligence ought to govern the country—if it was necessary to keep out the mass, that property and intelligence should be represented—why now compel them to side with the multitude and join the enemies of order! Where the times such that the cause of good government could spare one of its natural allies; (*Cheers.*)

If he wished to set forth the evils of the present system, he would refer to the Northren part of the metropolis, and adopting the illustration of Lord John Russell, continued.—

If he had that foreigner whom his Lordship had introduce into the debate, and wished to make him fully sensible of the peculiar evils of our system, he would conduct him to that great city which lies to the north of Oxford Street and the west of Russell Square. There he would show him a city that exceeded in size the capitals of many kingdoms, and even superior in intelligence and knowledge to any city on the face of the globe. He would there show him long lines of interminable streets and spacious squares, filled with well-built, magnificent houses, inhabited by populent and intelligent men, some of the first citizens of the state. He would show him the magnificent shops, the splendid apartments; he would carry him to the palaces that stretch along each side of the Regent's Park, and he would tell him that the rental of these palaces and houses exceeded the rental of all Scotland at the time of the Union; and then he would tell that stranger, that all this wealth and intelligence were unrepresented. He should not need to refer to Leeds, or Manchester, or Macclesfield, or to tell him that Scotland had only the shadow of a representation. The principles of the property-tax, he believed, was, that no income below. 150*l.* per annum's should be taxed; and he doubted, should he include only the property assessed to that tax, if he should find one half of the persons who paid that tax had any votes for representatives. One fiftieth part of those persons returned a greater number of representatives than did the other forty-nine parts. Ours, then, was not a government on the principle of property; if was only a Goverunment founded on some fragments of property, and no principle whatever presided over its formation.

Sir Robert Inglis had said that the system of representation was never better, but the House was not there to inquire into what it had been, but to make it what it ought to be.

They were not antiquaries, but legislators. It was their duty to consider whether it could be made better than it was at present. The Constitution might have been good at some former time, but it did not now correspond to the existing state of the country. If it had stood still, the population and intelligence of the country had been continually in progress. Lord Stormont said openly and manfully, that the borough he represented was the same now as it was when it was first called on to send representatives to Parliament in the time of Edward the First? But though that borough was the same, had not the population, of the country materially changed? Was it the same now as in the days of Edward the First? Small places had now become large cities, and the population, which did not then exceed two millions, was now multiplied seven-fold. The increase of wealth was even greater than the increase of the population, and both had materially changed. They, however, were to legislate for their own time, and not for the ages that were passed; they could not possibly think it right that the seat of Government should be transferred to York, and that London should be only the second city of the empire, because York was the capital of the country in the time of Constantius Chlorus? Was the representation of the country, adapted for two millions of people, to be now kept as it was established in the thirteenth century!

In answer to the complaint that the Constitution had been vioated, Mr. Macauley asked, Which of the laws had not been violated?—They had all been violated.

By the old original Constitution, it was the right of the commonalty to raise the taxes; that right was guaranteed to the subjects by Magna Charta---so was freedom from arrest. Was that never violated; or, rather, was it not continually violated; down to the time of passing the Habeas Corpus Act? Great changes had taken place in every part of society since the period referred to. New property had been called into existence; society had assumed a different form, and much capital and much wealth, formerly unknown, were now unrepresented. Some towns had sunk to villageas, others had remained stationary, but many had risen from villages to be as large as London in the time of the Plantagents. Society had grown, but the policy of the Government had remained still; and the form of that must be renewed, to make it accord with that on which it depends. It was time, then, that our old institutions should b new modelled. But when it was said that we ought not to alter these institutions, be ause they were established by our ancestors, we ought to consider what they would do in our circumstances He did not deride the wisdom of our ancestors; they had modelled our institutions to suit the circumstances of their own times. He would not do as our ancestors had done, but he would do as they would do if they were in our circumstances.

Further, Sir Robert Inglis had described the measure as revolutionary. Was he not aware that society was always in a state of revolution, and that institutions must be changed to correspond to it?

That was confirmed by the political history of every country in Europe. The political history of the world could not be opened without finding some new interest coming into existence; at first it was weak, and was trampled on---then it grew strong, and pressed on those who trampled on it. If protection were then granted, well---if it were not granted, a struggle began. Such was the struggle between the Plebeians and Particians at Rome, and such was the struggle between the Cities and Nobles of Italy. Such was the struggle in Ireland between the Catholics and Protestants till the former were released from their servitude. Such, too, was the struggle now going on in Jamaica between the Freemen of Colour and the Aristocracy of the Skin; and such was the struggle between the middle classes of England and the Aristoracy - men of localities---the aristocracy merely of gentlemen, not distinguished for talents or genius---and which, by withholding a due share of the representation from the middle order, was making itself noxious in the sight of all Europe, which beheld with wonder the wealth and intelligence of the people whom this Aristocracy excluded from political power.

Sir Robert had also said, that unrepresented cities had their interests as well taken care of as if they were represented; and that his votes were given as much with a view to the interest of Manchester as Oxford. Mr. Macauley said, that was the old doctrine of virtual representation, and he could not understand the reasoning of those who stood up for virtual representation, because it was noxious.

He could not comprehend how that power which was virtually so beneficial, should be, when directly exercised, so injurious. If the influence were good virtually exercised, it must be good directly exercised. It was a strange position to hold, that virtual representation was good, and that real representation was evil. If there was an evil in change—if change was such an evil was not discontent, a discontent, an evil; This was the strong part of the case of those who oppose the measure. It was said that the system worked well. He denied that the system worked well, as it regarded the people of England, though it might work well for a few people in that House. Was that a good system which was approved of by no other six hundred and fifty eight men in the kingdom? Let them take the same number of men by chance from the shopkeepers and respectable middle classes in any part of the country, and they would say that the system did not work well. Let them take any number of the middle classes by lot, then they would find that the people had no confidence in the present representation. He was not defending this feeling; he was only arguing from it as a fact, and it would be well if it were abstained from; but, existing in the people, it was a proof that they believed that the system worked ill.

He proceeded to show the cause of the unpopularity of the present system of representation.

It was the theory of the Constitution that property should be represented. Why not make the practice comply with the theory? The people did not forget what was due to the King, and what was due to the Peers. It was against that House that the popular voice was raised; and there was a good reason, for *corruptio optimi pessima*. Burke had properly described the House of Commons as a check not *on*, but a check *for* the people. There were many other checks on them, but the House of Commons was the check for them. "If the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?" If the check for the people was corrupted, how were

they to keep other evils in check? It was not extraordinary, then that the people should have lost their feelings of respect for the House of Commons. They had not lost their respect for the King—they had not lost their respect for the Aristocracy, as long as the Aristocracy remained in its proper sphere; but they had lost their respect for the representative system of the country.

It had been said that the popular excitement in favour of Reform was a temporary feeling—the result of the revolution in Belgium and in France. He had read history very falsely if the feeling sprang from these causes.

The plague of discontent was not the growth of the day. It possessed all the symptoms of a deep-seated malady. The present discontent had been growing through two generations. The Legislature had tried every means in its power to put an end to it. It had called new laws into operation. What had it not done? Was it to be supposed that any probable measure of cure had escaped the subtlety of Burke or the sagacity of Windham? Had not every species of coercion been tried by Lord Londonderry? Had not laws been passed to put down public meetings and to enthral the Press?—and was not the evill still in existence, and was it not increasing from day to day? What had they not done to palliate it?—and what more palliatives could they try? What farther palliatives had they?

Under these circumstances, the Government proposed to adapt the system of representation to the present state of the country.

The proposed measure was a practical measure, adapted to the wants of the country. It was founded on the good practical principle of giving to the middle classes political power. It was calling into alliance with the ordinary principles of good government all the intelligence of the middle classes. He congratulated the Ministry on their standing or falling by such a measure. If he were in their place, he would rather fall with such a system of represention than stand on any other question. (*Cheers.*)

The objections to the plan of Lord John Russell did not seem to Mr. Macauley important. Sir Robert Inglis had stated one objection, which, if it were well-founded, would be an attack upon other parts of the constitution. He had told the House, that a reformed House of Commons could not exist for ten years without pulling down the Throne, and destroying the House of Lords.

It was impossible, Sir Robert said, that the property and intelligence of the middle classes could be adequately represented without the result being to pull down the majesty of the Throne and the dignity of the Aristocracy. If that were a true description—if that could be laid to the charge of the country, which he did not believe—if that argument were correct, it spoke volumes against the Monarchy and the Aristocracy. Nothing ever said by Thomas Paine could be more injurious. Monarchy and Aristocracy were not valuable in themselves. They were means to an end. If the bill should produce a republic by improving the representation—though he was convinced it would have no such effect—if what the honourable member for Oxford says were true, if giving the great body of the intelligent and middle classes a share in the Government, would lead to the destruction of the Aristocracy, and the demolition of the Throne—what did that imply, but that these two were opposed to the welfare of the nation? It would not bear an argument to assert, that admitting the middle classes to a share of the representation would subvert the Government of the King and the Peers. If that were the only objection to the measure, there was no ground whatever for opposing it.

Mr. Macauley admitted that many great and eminent men had been returned for close boroughs; but in estimating the system fairly, it was proper to consider general tendencies and not accidents.

Despotism was detestable as a system, but it had some good accidents; he would not, therefore, like to submit to a master who might destroy him at any moment. It would scarcely be possible by any other mode of election not to bring some eminent men into the House. If the boroughs were done away, able men would still find their way into it. If one hundred of the tallest men of the kingdom were to be ellected members of Parliament, some among them would be eminent. If one hundred men of a tawny complexion were to be representatives, men of eminence, too, would be found amongst them. In ancient times, a king was chosen by the neighing of a horse; and though nobody would recommend that mode of chosing a King, it might happen that one so chosen might be a good king. In the great city of Athens, it was well known that all public officers were chosen by lot, which could not be recommended; yet it had once caused Socrates to be chosen, and had enabled him to resist an unjust measure. It was, therefore, not the accidents of any system, but its general tendencies, that must be considered. Whatever might be our system of representation, clever men would find their way into that House. They might not be the same men as would come in under the borough system, but they would be men of talents, and no one man was indespensably necessary. A great nation needed no one individual. Let them give the country good institutions, and they would be sure to find good and great men.

The learned member expressed his surprise at the charge of Mr. Twiss, who had said that the measure attacked property, and had compared it to the proceeding which took place at the close of the reign of Charles the Second, for disfranchising the cities and boroughs.

If the franchise were property which was not to be taken away without a compensation—if it was not to be withdrawn but after a judicial investigation, and after proof of guilt, and some crime had been fully established, what must be said to the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders, which, on this doctrine, was a flagitious robbery? They were all at once deprived of their rights without any charge, without having been guilty of any crime, without having been heard, and without a thought of compensation. If the franchise at Bath were a property, was it not also a property at Waterford?—and was it not to be taken away in the latter case when no crime could be imputed?—unless, indeed, it was a crime in the Catholic freeholders of Clare to elect the present honourable member for Waterford for that county, and but to punish the forty-shilling Catholic freeholders the Protestant forty-shilling freeholders had been disfranchised.

Some of the Ministers, who supported the present measure, had undoubtedly been at some former time opposed to Parliamentary Reform The country would not think the worse of them, nor value their services the less because they had shown themselves capable of learning by experience—that they had profited by their observations, and were no longer opposed to what they and many others saw was an inevitable change. He wished that other persons would learn a similar lesson.

Was it possible that those who now despised this lesson could forget the humiliating lesson they were taught not long ago by an absolute resistance to a measure which was rendered inevitable by the progress of society! Was it possible that those who arrogantly censured others should not recollect that they were obliged to surrender what they strove in vain to defend! In May 1827, the right honourable Baronet Sir Robert Peel—of whom he wished to speak with all the respect that was not inconsistent with his sincere desire to serve his country on such an important question—the right honourable Baronet who had just before quitted office, demanded of the Government of that day what it meant to do with respect to the Test and Corporation Acts, Parliamentary Reform, and Catholic Emancipation and then the right honourable Baronet stated that he should give to these questons his decided opposition. Such was the case four years ago, and how stood the case now with these great questions? The Test and Corporation Acts had been repealed and they were repealed by the Ministers who succeeded Mr. Canning. The penal laws against the Catholics had been repealed and they were repealed by the Ministers who succeeded Mr. Canning. There remained Parliamentary Reform; and whoever beheld the signs of the times the important signs that hourly manifested must be convinced that unless the question of Parliamentary Reform were speedily settled—unless the people were given some share in the representation and had their affection for our institutions restored, there was great hazard of our being exposed to a most fearful danger. (*No, no! Heac, hear!*) He could not believe that those versed in political affairs would not so read these signs, and would not be convinced that the representation of England must be altered before 1860. Why, then did they now wait? Was it merely to show that they had not profited by experience? Did they wait till the public resolution became irresistible? Did they want more disturbance a larger mass of discontent a more perfect system of organization—a higher collection of rent—more skilful agitators—and a more complete development of power than that which existed in 1827, Were those scenes to be acted over again? Or were those who, as Ministers, had brought them on were now crying out "No Reform!" to become Reformers, as they had then cried "No Popery!" to become Emancipators. (*Cheers.* Had they forgotten the history of Ireland, where the Catholics were indulged in rebellion, because they were denied justice? There were signs abroad and none could see them with his eyes, or hear them with his ears, or understand with his heart, and not think it his duty to stand between them and the great and serious effects which might be anticipated. Reform should be given as a means of preservation. Now, then, when every thing was alarming around us—when it would be madness to invite a struggle, with that spirit of the age which had just crushed the proudest Crown in Europe and when we saw the palaces of our Sovereign supplying an ignominious asylum to the expelled heir of forty kings—when we have seen the great discontent but while the heart of England was yet sound, while the national feelings of many old associations were yet retained bound to the honour and character of the country, and which might soon, pass away—now was the accepted and sure time. (*No, no! Hear, hear!*) Now was the accepted time—this was the day of our salvation when if wedid not act in a faulty spirit of consistency but with a due regard to the signs of these portentous times—now was the promised moment the worthy time, when the great debt due from the Aristocracy to the people should be paid. If they attended to these signs, they would secure the safety of the country and rich advantages to all. If the measure were lost he prayed to God that those who should vote against it might never be brought by the results of that vote to regret the not having employed the means in their power to prevent the dissolution of social order. (*Long continued cheering.*)

Lord MAHON differed from Lord John Russell, on the same principle that he agreed with him formerly. Then, he was restoring the Constitution, but the present was a revolutionary measure. He contended that the existing feeling in favour of reform would soon pass away.

Mr. HUNT deprecated some strong language used by Mr. Macauley respecting Radical Reformers and the lower orders of the people: he feared its only tendency would be to produce difference of opinion out of doors, by representing the question as one between the middle and inferior rank of society. He thought the bill did not go far enough, inas much as the conceived that any tradesmen earning 30s. a week was as well qualified to give an honest vote, and as well entitled, as the wealthiest man in the realm. If any part of the people were to be denied the exercise of the elective franchise, then consistency demanded that they should be free from taxes and from services to the State, in whose regulation they had no voice. If Government took their money, it should also take their votes. He declared, however, that the sweeping away of the rotten boroughs was a measure which claimed and should receive his unqualified approbation; and that though the bill was not all he wished, still it was much better than he had anticipated, and he should give it his hearty support. In the course of his speech, Mr. Hunt forced the House to listen to some very unpalatable observations regarding the Manchester massacre, and his own imprisonment in Ilchester Gaol "for two years and six months." He contrasted those times with the present.

Lord MORPETH said, if the House were prepared to declare that the demand for Reform was not proper—that the evil was not manifest—that the corruption was not glaring—they might with perfect consistency determine not to give up a stone of Gatton, and to die in the ditch of Old Sarum, where there was nothing but a ditch to die in. He believed, however, that the House would not so far outrage the sense of the community as to say that they would not so much as entertain the question. The question of Reform had been supported by the constitutional authority of Lord Chatham, the talent and integrity of George Saville, the young energies of Mr. Pitt, and the consistent manhood of Mr. Fox. Those were high authorities. It was true there was one great name opposed to Reform. It was the only point upon which he differed with the late Mr. Canning in the latter part of his career. What course Mr. Canning would now have pursued, it was not for him to determine; but that great staterman had laid down the principle, that when two extreme parties were agitating society, it was the duty of a patriot to steer clear of both of them. Two extreme parties were at present agitating the country. One was opposed to all amelioration, and the other advocated the worst species of Reform, with the view of subverting the existing institutions, and all the gradations and ranks of society. Between these two extremes the only safe path was the conservative principle to which the measure submitted to the House led. *To that let them hold fast.*

Sir CHARLES WETHERELL, member for Boroughbridge, designated the disfranchisement of the rotten boroughs as corporation robbery. True, there were 106 members to be added for the 168 that were taken away, but did that lessen the guilt of the robbery?

Was it less a measure of robbery and pillage, if they took from A. B. and C. D. and gave to E F., and if the House was to be composed of 60 members less than at present? This cutting off, this amputation of 60 members, was an odd sort of a thing. No Reformer yet, still less a Reforming Cabinet, had ever produced a plan of Reform which began by cutting off. (*Cheers.*) This was a plan for which his Majesty's present Cabinet deserved the credit—the present Cabinet of Althorp and Co. (*Order.*) The present Cabinet of the noble Lord and his associates, then, who seemed to have proceeded upon the precedent in the history of England which had been set by Cromwell, Fairfax, Milburne, and Co. (*Cheers.*) Those worthy regicides set about in reducing the number of members of the House, and this plan of cutting off the boroughs and confining the number of members had not the merit of originality, for it was almost the same in form, in substance, and in principle, as the Radical system of Reform which had been introduced by regicides when they established a Commonwealth in England. Yet it was said that the object of the measure was to preserve our ancient institutions. Conservation was to be the rule of the system.

The question was not one of Reform. It was most unjustly argued that every man who opposed the question must be opposed to Reform. He denied the imputation. The question was one of radical change.

Did gentlemen recollect how many experimental Governments were now afloat?—that there was a question to settle as to a constitution for Greece?—another as to a constitution for Portugal?—that in Belgium there were yet unsettled the relations of the President and the Representative Government? Did Gentlemen recollect what had taken place in France? Did they recollect that in South America, for the last seven or eight years, new Governments were continually appearing; and that, notwithstanding, they had no government there yet? (*Cheers.*) "Let me," said Sir Charles, "be permitted, as I am in *extremis*, to utter the last dying expression of the wish of an expiring man,—I must distinguish my natural death from my civil death,—it is that Great Britain may not be added to the catalogue of experimental states (*Cheers.*)

There was no precedent in the history of England for such spoliation of corporate rights as the bill of Ministers contemplated.

He defied the whole cabinet, and all its deputies, military and civil, to cite a case of any corporation having its charactered rights abrogated at one fell swoop, without a case of delinquency having been even insinuated against it,—without any form of trial, without any pretext, palliative of such monstrous conduct, without any shadow of argument; unless, forsooth, the telling them they were bigoted adherents to the laws and usages of the constitution were received in argument. (*Cheers.*)

The only case was the Cambridge case in the time of Richard the First—that was the solitary precedent on which the Ministerial bill must be found. He adverted to the refusal of Mr. Fox to sanction the disfranchisment of Nottingham because of the conduct of the electors in 1802; and to his voting along with Lord Eldon against the disfranchisement of New Shoreham, because, as Mr. Fox contended, if corporations were so destroyed as these corporations were sought to be, none, however pure, would in future be safe from attack.

He would ask, as Mr. Fox had done on these occasions, if once the principle of charter spoliation be admitted, where were they to stop? Did the honourable Alderman behind him (Waithman) recollect any thing of the *quo warranto* robbery of the corporation of the City of London's charter in the time of Charles the Second? (*A laugh.*) If he did, then his vote was, to use a homely expression, as surely nailed down against the present scheme of the noble Paymaster, as he (Sir C. Wetherell) had nailed down the spurious coinage which the military deputy of the Cabinet had given them by way of argument. And why did he thus count on the honourable Alderman's voting with him, simply on the old maxim *hodi mihie oras tibi*—what may succeed to do with respect to some obscure borough, may be tried with equal success to-morrow with the corporation of London itself?

Sir Charles strongly deprecated the threat of dissolution which had been held out in the event of the House not accepting of the bill presented by Ministers.

He must say, with respect to that most unconstitutional and Insolent menace, that the man who would be influenced by it in his vote on the present momentous occasion, would be nothing less than a rebel to his country. The man, who such a threat, uttered by any Government—particularly by one so vacilating and individually opposed, and only united in this one monstrous measure of wholesale spoliation, would influence—was a man unworthy of the name of British senator—was a recreant in morals—was a man wholly deaf to the call of conscience, and of English liberty. (*Continued Cheering.*)

He rediculed the idea that the country, which sought for bread, was to be satisfied with the stone which the Ministers offered.

He should like to hear how the First Lord of the Admirality would explain at Cockermouth to his constituents his conduct since he last addressed them. On that occasion, retrenchment unlimited was to be the order of the day, all taxes burdensome to the middle and poorer classes were to be removed, and the constitution was to be restored to its ancient splendour, by a full and satisfactory measure of Reform. Now what answer could the right honourable baronet make to one of his agricultural constituents. if thus accosted by him: "Well, Sir James have you taken off the malt-tax?" (*Laughter.*) "No," quoth the right honourable baronet. "Have you," rejoins the farmer, at least taken off the assessed-taxes?" "No," again quoth the First Lord of the Admiralty, "the House of Commons and a sense of duty prevented me." (*Laughter.*) "Then," again quoth the farmer, "since you have neither repealed the malt-taxes, nor the assessed-taxes, what the Devil have you done?" (*Laughter.*) "Why, we have not, to be sure, retrenched much in the way of taxes, but to make amends we have made a pretty considerable retrenchment in the House of Commons; if we have not taken off the malt tax we have taken off sixty-two members." (*Continued laughter.*)

There existed in Cromwell's time a purge of the House of Commons. (*Laughter.*) The purge was called Prige's purge. (*Laughter and cheering.*) The gentlemen on the opposite side of the House were close imitators of the Cromwellian system; they were prepared to expel, by one strong dose, no less than one hundred and sixty-eight members of that house. To the specific which the House had been promised by the noble Lord, as no name had yet been attached, he would attach the name of Russell's purge. (*Roars of laughter and great cheering for sometime.*) The principle of the bill was republican. The principle of it was destructive of all property, of all right, of all privilege; it was the same principle of arbitrary violence which expelled a majority of the members from that House in the time of the Commonwealth, which now, after the lapse of a century from the Revolution, during which the population had enjoyed greater happiness was ever enjoyed by any population under heaven, the Ministry were desirous of applying to the House of Commons. (*Loud cheering for some minutes.*)

Sir THOMAS DENMAN, the Attorney-General, replied to Sir Charles Wetherell.

He admired the humour with which his honourable and learned friend had compared the purification of the representative system which this bill attempted to accomplish to the two purges of the House which took place in Cromwell's time, and to the proceedings on the *quo warranto* which took place in the reigns of Charles the Second and James the Second. They might be cited indeed, by way of contrast, they did not bear the most remote analogy to each other. What Sir Charles meant by an attempt to compare the proposed plan of Reform with Pride's Purge he was utterly at a loss to devine. Did he recollect that Lord Clarendon in describing

the plan of Reform which Cromwell brought forward said that it was worthy of imitation by other parties? Surely he did not mean to say that Colonel Pride's purge had any thing to do with Cromwell's system of Reform! Then, as to the *quo warrantos*. The *quo warrantos* took away certain rights from corporate bodies; but what rights did this bill deprive them of? The power of voting was no municipal right. The power of selling a vote to a duke's or a peer's, or to a duke's nominee or to a peer's nominee however palatable and delightful it might appear, was not a reason why a corporate jurisdiction was established in any borough.

Sir Charles had expressed himself indignant at its being imputed to him that he was an enemy to improvement in the representation.

When, where, how, in what shape, had he ever professed himself a friend to it? The Attorney-General had never heard such a sentiment from Sir Charles before—it was brought forward on the present occasion to break with the public the force of the Government plan of Reform: it certainly was not the practical view which his honourable and learned Friend and his habitual political friends were accustomed to take on the subject, and if it had recently become their view, it was because they had been driven to it by the force of the public opinion. *(Loud cheers.)* If they were advocates to any extent, would they inform him what their plan was, and how far it went? Unless they meant to say that the miserable plan of disfranchising Evesham and East Retford was their plan of Reform, he knew of no plan of reform which they had ever patronized. That because in Evesham money had been paid to the electors, and the payment of it had been discovered by a committee formed of members whose only merit was that they had not been found out in making such payments,—that because they were ready in such a case to make the most vigiant, inquiry into the number of poor wretchers who had contaminated their fingers with the bribes held out to them by their wealthy tempters—that because they were willing to do this, they were to represent themselves friendly to Reform, was a project against which he, as an honest man, felt bound to enter his protest. *(Cheers.)* He looked upon a plan of reform so difficult, and distant of execution, to be a needless expense of money and of time, and an assured hypocrisy, insulting to the people at large. *(Great cheering.)*

A good deal, Sir Thomas said had been made, of the opinions of several great departed named in the course of these debates. With respect to Mr. Canning, he had staved off Reform as long as he could, on the sole grounds that the system worked well because the people were satisfied with it. Could he have made use of such an argument now! The close boroughs were represented as the portals by which genius found access to the House—

When he was told that Burke, and Pitt, and Fox and other illustrious characters had one and all owed their introduction into Parliament to the defects [redacted] he would reply that it was not for the happiness or glory of those individuals that they had found their way into that House by any other road than that of the free choice of the Commons of England. It happened, curious enough, that all the opinions of Mr. Fox, which the gentlemen opposite were so fond of quoting, were delivered by him at a time when he was sitting for a close borough.—when he was a Lord of Admiralty; and, strange recommendation! when he was by law incapacitated by his youth from voting in that House.

Mr. Shelly and others had told the House a great deal about the independence of the members for rotten boroughs. Sir Thomas said he would only in answer state his own experience on the subject.

In the year 1818, he was given to understand that there was a wish that he should be in Parliament. A seat was offered him for the borough of Wareham: and, to his shame be it spoken, he had not had virtue to resist it. He should have respected himself more if he had. Nothing could be more kind and liberal than the conduct of those who gave him a seat for that borough; but at the end of the two first sessions in which he sat in Parliament, there was a dissolution; and then he found, that in their opinion he had been found wanting. *(Hear, hear!)* There was then no nomination-seat for him; and if the town of Nottingham had not sent a deputation to him to come forward, he should have been out of Parliament. So far from a seat for a rotten borough being all joy, he could assure the House that it was quite the reverse. Could there, indeed, be any thing more harassing than the idea of having a secret council always sitting upon your conduct, and determining upon each vote, whether you ought to be permitted to retain your seat in Parliament or not? *(Hear, hear!)* He made no complaint against those who gave him his seat; but when he contrasted his situation of member for a close borough, with his situation as member for Nottingham, in which he enjoyed the confidence of thousands, he felt that there was no more comparison to be made between them than between the crumbling walls of Aldborough and the most stately and magnificent palace in England. *(Cheers.)*

They had been told that the people would remonstrate against the present plan of Reform.

Was it possible that the gentlemen who told them this could be sincere? that they could really lieve what they said If so, let them wait but a little while—let them see whether the people who might assemble in various parts of the country, would re-echo the sentiments of the mourners at the funeral of the defunct member for Boroughbridge, and murmur and remonstrate that it was proposed to confer upon them a better system of representation. *(cheers.)*

Lord PALMERSTON contended that the people of this country sought for a change, because the state of the country demanded it.

Among the many instances which he could cite in proof of that fact, he would for the present only mention one,—that they (the Ministers) were now seated on those benches which had been so recently occupied by honourable gentlemen opposite. *(Cheers from the Ministerial benches, echoed by those of the Opposition.)* Gentlemen might say what they pleased, but it was not the difference about the civil list—it was not the reduction of the salaries of some half-dozen offices—which caused the overthrow of the late Administration. The rock which they split upon was their defiance of public opinion. They went on spreading wide the canvas of patronage as they proceeded; but that patronage, and the use they made of it to accelerate their progress and increase their power, proved their ruin. He would again repeat it, the besetting sin of the last Administration was a disregard of public opinion—of public opinion at home—of public opinion abroad. The error of the course they pursued did not unfortunately end with their power: it had become the means of setting Europe in flames.

It was the duty of Government, when public opinion was so strong in favour of a changes, to concede it in such a manner as to impair the advantages we possess. In looking at the proposed change, let the House consider some of the evils which it was intended to remedy.

What had for years produced so much misgovernment—so much of disregard to public opinion? The gross bribery and corruption practised, and undue influence at elections, by means of which so many of them came in either without constituents, or only with those whom they had purchased and might sell again. When, by such practices the people were driven to tear aside the veil of sanctity with which hereditary respect had invested even the imperfections of the constitution, it was impossible that they whose limited propositions of reform had been rejected, should not be led to demand wider and more extensive changes. There were many men in that House who wished things to remain as they were, and who would be willing to bear the faults of the constitution for the sake of its many excellences. He would tell them, that if they were now compelled to choose between a change which they feared, and the evil consequences of the refusal of that change, the blame must rest on those who three years ago refused to make even the smallest concession to public feeling. *(Cheers.)* If, three years ago, advantage had been taken of the conviction of corrupt boroughs to bring gradually into connexion with that House the great unrepresented towns,—if, instead of drawing nice equations between the manufacturing and the agricultural interests, they had turned Reformers on ever so moderate a scale, the House would not now have been discussing the plan of general Reform proposed by his noble friend. *(Hear.)* He had supported all those proposals for limited reform, because he thought them good in themselves, and because he clearly saw, that if they were refused, we should be obliged to have recourse to wider and more extensive changes; but his predictions had been condemned and disregarded. For reasons similar to those for which he then supported those limited propositions of reform, he was now prepared to support the more extensive measure.

He vindicated himself from the taunt of inconsistency flung that evening from the opposite side; and assured the House, that had Mr. Canning himself lived to these times, he would have been a Reformer. Any one who looked at the constitution of the representation of this House, could not fail to be struck by five prominent defects,—the nomination boroughs; the gross, general, and barefaced corruption which prevailed, not only in small, but also in large places; the want of members for some of the greatest and most important manufacturing towns; the expenses of elections, and the unequal distribution among different classes of society of that power which resulted from the exercise of the elective franchise. To all these defects the plan of Government applied sound and wholesome remedies. At the same time he maintained that the proposed measure would not destroy the wholesome influence of the Aristocracy—that influence which was obtained by eminent worth, by moral and intellectual distinction, and by exercising towards their inferiors those qualities which secured the affections and gained the admiration of men.

The plan would introduce to a share in the government of the country the great bulk of the middle classes of the kingdom. Mr. Twiss had chosen to make himself merry at the expence of the middle classes. He was pleased to say, that shopkeepers, small attornies, innkeepers, and publicans, were totally unfit to enjoy and share in the representation. *(No, no!)* He could assure honourable members that he was not speaking from memory, for he had taken down the gentleman's words. But he would ask him in what respect were the potwallopers more fitted to chose representatives than respectable shopkeepers and even small attornies? Mr. Baring had asked why, if it were dangerons to trust the potwallopers with the elective franchise beyond twenty years, not disfranchise them now! The answer was, that though the Government thought that description of voters should be extinguished, they did not see such danger in continuing the elective franchise as to induce them to take it away during the lives of those who now possessed it. He believed that the proposition would prove satisfactory to the country; and not withstanding the taunts which had been thrown on the middle classes, there did not exist in any country a body of men more entitled to respect and confidence. *(Hear!)*

Sir ROBERT PEEL began by assuring Lord Palmerston, that he did not join in the taunts against him, for changing his opinions, or the course which he deemed it his duty to follow on the present occasion. Sir Robert himself had been placed in the same situation; he had found it necessary, from a due regard to the principles which had always regulated his conduct, to adopt a different course from that which he had formerly advocated; and he therefore ought to be the last man to refuse the indulgence of which he had stood in need to public men who were placed in a similar situation. He never would believe that public men did not look to higher motives than a desire to retain their places, when they were induced to change their opinions; and the character, the views, and the conduct of his noble friend afforded a sufficient guarantee for the purity of his motives. Having thus imitated the generous custom which prevailed on less dignified and more deadly encounters,—having, as he might say, shaken hands with his noble friend, by relieving himself from any suspicion of personal hostility in what he should say, the noble Lord would not be displeased, if, with perfect freedom of discussion, he subjected his speech to some observation and comment.

"At a time when the House had been expecting that some member of his Majesty's Government would give some explanation of this measure,—at a moment when the House wished to know, not what was the public opinion of it, but what practical ground could be alleged for the adoption of a new constitution—at this moment the noble Lord thought fit to enter into a comparison of the merits of the late and the present Administrations; and the greater part of his speech was composed—not of the arguments which the House so much deprecated on the necessity of the Reform, but of sarcastic allusions to the conduct and opinions of the late Administration, connected with an attempt, and not a very successful one, to magnify the deeds of the present Government at the expense of that Government which was lately honoured with his Majesty's confidence. My noble friend says that if there had not been a change in the Government, the same results would not have taken place. In that opinion I am much disposed to concur. No party hostility shall ever prevent me from doing justice whenever justice should be done, or bestowing praise wherever praise ought to be bestowed. The conduct of the noble Earl at the head of the Administration, with reference to Ireland, and the conduct of the noble Marquis to whom have been intrusted the reins of the Irish Government, are entitled to unequivocal commendation; and there is certainly some truth in the statement of my noble friend, that had we remained in office we might not have been able to effect what the present Government have effected. But should we have had the same assistance? *(Cheers.)* Should we, if, at a period of great excitement, produced by a general demand for retrenchment, we had produced estimates of increased extent, have found all party considerations yield to a generous feeling for the public service? Should we have found a united and generous disposition in all parts of the House to supply the Executive Government with the means of defeating whatever efforts might be made to disturb the public tranquillity? Sir, I will not enter into any comparison of the merits of the two Administrations But let my noble friend recollect that the instrument of which the noble Marquis at the head of the Irish Government availed himself with his characteristic vigour and success, was an instrument placed in his hands by his Majesty's late Government, and which was constructed against the opinion and vote of some of the present Ministers. If we found it difficult to preserve peace in Ireland for want of a legal and constitutional force, let it be remembered that it was not by the late Government that the reduction of the yeomanry was commenced." *(Cheers)*

Sir Robert thought the allusion to East Retford unfortunate as an argument in favour of the present bill. Himself and Lord Palmerston, on the fatal night which led to the first breaking up of the late Government, entered the House with the intention of voting on the same side; and it was an accident of the debate which induced Mr. Huskisson to vote against the general opinion of the Government, and in consequence of this to resign.

"But, to pass from that topic, my noble friend says, that if in 1818 we had consented to transfer the elective franchise from the borough of East Retford to the town of Bermingham, there would not have been the least necessity for agitating at the present moment the question of Parliamentary Reform, for that that would have satisfied the whole country *(No, no, no!)* What! would my noble friend himself have rested satisfied with the existing state of the representation, notwithstanding five grand defects which he had described as existing in it? Would my noble friend have rested satisfied to let so gross a system of corruption continue, without any attempt to secure the country from its baleful influence?" *(Cheers.)*

Sir Robert ridiculed, very successfully, the notion that Mr. Canning would have supported such a bill as this—he who had refused even to transfer the franchise of Penryn to Manchester.

He now came to the tremendous question before the House; but before he approached the consideration of it, he must confess that he was afflicted with great pain and humilitation, beyond any thing he had ever experienced in considering a question of this description.

"I am asked, I will not say to make a revolution in the country, but to substitute for the present system a different constitution; and I am not invited, to do this after a calm and dispassionate inquiry, but to take this hasty step by an appeal to motives, which if I were to act upon, I should not be subjecting my fears to my judgment, but my judgment to my fears. *(Loud cheers.)* Before I proceed further, I would ask, why has the King's name been introduced in this discussion? Is this necessary, day after day, in both Houses of Parliament, and in the public press to state that this measure has been brought forward with the express and peculiar sanction of the King? I hold it to be no imputation upon any respect and loyalty to the Crown, if I disregard the intimation that the King has sanctioned this measure, and if, as a member of Parliament, I exercise my judgment on the merits of the question as unreservedly, as if no such intimation had been given. *(Loud cheers.)* But I regret, on other grounds, that the name of the King should be obtruded day after day. I cannot dismiss from my mind doubts as to the justice and expediency of this extreme measure of disfranchisement; but granting that they do exist it is still a harsh measure towards the loyal bodies who are called upon the sacrifice privileges which they have long exercised; and even if it was justly introduced, why should the King, the fountain of grace and favour, he held out as the special author of the plan?

"The House has been menaced with dissolution. *(Noise.)* The chances of dissolution are as strong if the measure be carried as if it fail. I care not if the House be dissolved or not; nor should I be fit for the performance of a single legislative duty if I permitted any such menace to influence me; I care not whether I am returned again or not; but if I felt any anxiety about it, I should go to my constituents with this bill in my hand, and place my special ground to their renewed confidence upon my determined opposition to it. *(Cheers.)* I would go to a community whose numbers, by the return of 1821, were not more than 4000 inhabitants, and tell them that this bill has been brought in without any allegation of necessity, or without any case being made out against them, and that I opposed it. I know that they never abused their rights—that the humblest man among them never received or asked a bribe for the vote they gave. They received me when subjected to the indignity of expulsion for what I conceived to be a special act of duty, even to that Church of which I am a humble member. They returned me as their representative; and till the necessity of the measure be established by more cogent arguments than I have yet heard, I will not consent to deprive them of their right.

The House was told that the members who rejected the bill would be responsible for the consequences.

He would say to Ministers—"Don't shift from your own shoulders the weight of responsibility which attaches to the proposal of such a measure; don't say we will prove our capacity to govern, but boast rather of your ability to destroy." *(Cheers.)* He at least had not been one who industriously excited the stormy wave of the multitude—who employed all his faculities to create dissatisfaction and discontent. He at least had never uttered the language of a noble Lord in 1827 who found the people peaceful, quiet, and contented, and complained that he could not rouse their indignation against the constitution of the House of C[redacted] prone people were to receive disclaimers of

mons—who grieved that they were so apathetic as to prove "deaf to the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely." He at least never called for a list of the names of one hundred and thirteen Privy Councillors, in order to direct against them the full torrent of popular displeasure and resentment, on account of the remuneration afforded to their services. Neither had he ever instituted any invidious comparisons between the great naval commanders and the civillians who presided over the Admiralty. Neither had he instigated and encouraged any body of men to display, under the very windows of the seat of Government, a foreign emblem of revolution. He had never been the person to excite the people to a pitch of phrensy, to spur their lazy indifference to an emulation in revolutionary clamour. If, therefore, this measure, which common prudence would have forborne introducing at such a crisis in our foreign and domestic relations, when fresh causes of excitement ought to be cautiously avoided—if, he said, this extraordinary measure should be defeated, he would never allow that the responsibility of the disappointment could attach to him or to any other individual member of that House. *(Loud cheers.*

Particular penegyrics on the Constitution had been exhausted. He had heard quotations from Mr. Burke, Mr. Canning, and other great men, now no more, in assertion of the excellence of the British Constitution. But he had higher and living authority on the subject. He would read to the House the most complete and beautiful panegyric by the noble member for Tavistock. In quoting it he begged the noble member who now proposed to lay violent hands on what was once the object of his warmest admiration, not to imagine that he intended to bring any charge against him for change of opinion. It may be that he has not changed his opinion; or that having done so, the change is justifiable, and therefore a matter of duty. Sir Robert Peel then read, in a most emphatic manner, amid the reiterated cheers of the House, the following passage of a speech delivered by Lord John Russell in 1819:—

"The question is, why not disfranchise the unconvicted boroughs? To this I answer, that I do not by any means maintain that the Resolutions I now propose, comprise all the amendments that can be made in the frame of this House. Whenever a specific proposition is made I shall be ready to give it all my attention, and if I can approve of it to adopt it. But I do not, at present, I confess, see any rule by which any unconvicted boroughs can be disfranchised without disfranchising the whole. We then arrive at what is called a Reform upon a principle, or the reconstruction of the entire House of Commons. Now, Sir, I will not dwell upon the arguments which are generally used to repel such a proposition; arguments resting chiefly upon the advantage of admitting men of talent into this House, by means of the close boroughs; and on the danger that an assembly of popular delegates would overthrow the two other branches of the Legislature. But I cannot forget that these arguments have been urged, not, as some out of doors endeavour to persuade the people, by boroughmongers anxious to defend their own vile interests, but by some of the greatest, the brightest, and the most virtuous men whom this country ever produced. I cannot say, however, that I give entire credit to these arguments, because I think that in political speculation the hazard of error is immense, and the result of the best formed scheme often different from that which has been anticipated. But for this very reason I cannot agree to the wholesale plans of Reform that are laid before us. We have no experience to guide us in the alterations which are proposed, at least none that is encouraging. There is, indeed, the example of Spain. Spain was formerly in the enjoyment of a free Constitution; but in the course of the fifteenth century many of the towns fell into the hands of the nobility, who, instead of influencing the elections of members to Cortes (the practice so much reprobated in this House), prevented their sending members at all. The consequence was, that when a struggle took place between the King and Cortes, the aristocracy felling no common interest with the representative body, joined the Crown, and destroyed for ever the liberties of their country. There is also the example of the present French Constitution, but that is of too recent a date, not to say of too precarious a nature, to make a rule for us to go by; we must come back then to our own laws. The Constitution of this country is not written down like that of some of our neighbours. I know not where to look for it, except in the division into King, Lords, and Commons, and in the composition of this House, which has long been the supreme body in the State. The composition of this House, by representatives of counties, cities, and boroughs, I take to be an intimate part of our Constitution. The House was so formed when they passed the Habeas Corpus Act—a law which, together with other wise laws, Mr. Cobbett himself desires to preserve, although, with strange inconsistency, whilst he cherishes the fruit he would cut down the [redacted]. This House was constituted on the same principle of counties, cities, and boroughs, when Montesquieu pronounced it to be the most perfect in the world. Old Sarum existed when Somers and the great men of the Revolution established our Government. Rutland sent as many members as Yorkshire when Hampden lost his life in defence of the Constitution. Are we, then, to conclude that Montesquieu praised a corrupt oligarchy? that Somers and the great men of that day expelled a King, in order to set up a many-headed tyranny? that Hampden sacrificed his life for the interest of a boroughmongering faction? No! the principles of the construction of this House are pure and worthy. If we should endeavour to change them altogether, we should commit the folly of the servant in the story of 'Aladin,' who is deceived by the cry of 'New lamps for old.' Our lamps is covered with dirt and rubbish, but it has a magical power. It has raised up a smiling land, not bestrode with overgrown palaces, but covered with thickset dwellings, every one of which holds a freeman, enjoying equal privileges and equal protections with the proudest subject in the land. It has called into life all the busy creations of commercial prosperity. Nor when men were wanting to illustrate and defend their country, have such men been deficient. When the fate of the nation depended upon the line of policy he should admit there were orators of the highest degree placing in the strongest light the arguments for peace and war. When we were engaged in war, we had warriors ready to gain us laurels in the field, or to wield our thunders on the sea. When, again, we returned to peace, the questions of internal policy, of education of the poor, and of criminal law, found men ready to devote the most splendid abilities to the wants of the most indigent class of the community! And, Sir, shall we change an instrument which has produced effects so wonderful for a burnished and tinsel article of modern manufacture? Now! small as the remaining treasure of the Constitution is, I cannot consent to throw it into the wheel for the chance of obtaining a prize in the lottery of constitutions."

Sir Robert went on to say, that he regarded the present measure as the expedient of men endeavouring to retain power. *(No, no.)*

He begged pardon if in error, but they all know

Digitized with financial assistance from the Government of Maharashtra on 08 April, 2017

anxiety to possess power with suspicion. And this allusion to office led him to another topic not disconnected with his subject. It had been industriously circulated, that with a view to outbid, or, rather underbid the noble lord in his measure for reform, and with a view to effecting a restoration to office, some member, of this side of the House would come forward with some plan of moderate reform of his own. He knew not really how to meet this absurd assertion. The fact was, that there is a class of newspaper writers who seem to think that the *summum bonum* of human felicity, the sole object of all our exertions and ambition, is the opportunity of wasting our time and health on the treasury bench opposite. For his part he was actuated by no such idle ambition. He might if such were his object, have proposed a plan of moderate reform; but as he had not done so, he persuaded himself that he afforded a proof that he had no ambition of office through such a channel. And this he might have done with the less hesitation, as he had never taken a decided violent part against the reform measures which had been discussed of late years in that House; so that he was not barred on the score of consistency, if the estimable blessing of sitting on the bench opposite, to be night after night badgered, were the object of his ambition. (*Cheers and laughter.*) After, indeed, he had lost the confidence of the House, and thence office, if Ministers had felt it necessary to propose a safe and moderate measure of reform of some branches of our representation, he would most probably have acted on the views taken by Mr. Macauley, of the overwhelming danger to be apprehended from all resistance to change, and have given it his support as a private individual, though he might not have thought it fit to originate it in an official capacity. He repeated, he would not have objected to a measure for extending the elective franchise to some places not at present possessing it. The right honourable gentlegman opposite smiled. He could assure him, with all truth and sincerity, and upon his honour as a gentleman, that he never had a conference with any individual on the subject, (Hear.) He spoke then wholly uninfluenced by persoual or party considerations, in his individual capacity,—as a man who had *a* far deeper stake in maintaining the integrity of existing institutions, than he could derive from the possession of any office. (*Hear.*) Feeling thus deeply interested in the well-being of the constitution, he could not consent to a measure which, in the words of the noble lord, went to reconstruct the very forms of that House; and, be the consequences what they may, so wholly did he despair of being able to modify the noble lord's bill into a kind of moderate measure less objectionable, that he would oppose the plan of the noble lord altogether. (*Immense cheering by the Opposition.*) And why would he act thus? Because, having attentively listened to the noble mover's statement, and to all that had been subsequently said for and against it, he felt convinced that if the noble lord's argument was good for anything, the measure which he then proposed could not be a final one, but a mere precedent to still more dangerous innovations.

Sir Robert then turned to the arguments adduced against the close borough system.

He was content to judge by the tendency and not accident of the close borough system, and would maintain that that tendency was essentially favourable to the entrance of men of ability into that House. He had that morning turned over the names of from twenty to twenty-five of the most distinguished men that had graced that House for the last thirty or forty years; and he found that, with three exceptions, they were all returned for boroughs, which the noble Lord's bill would wholly disfranchise. There was Mr. Gunning, Lord North, J. Townsend, Mr. Burke, Mr. Flood, Mr. Pitt, Mr. Fox. Lord Grenville, the Marquis Wellesley, Mr. Perceval, Lord Plunket. Mr. Canning, Mr. Wyndham, Mr. Horne, Mr. Huskisson, Mr. Brougham, Sir S. Romilly Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Tierney, Sir W. Grant, Lord Grey, and the late Lord Liverpool, all first returned for close boroughs, and but three of them ever members for counties. Nor was the mere facility of admission the only benefit. Tha introduction, by affording them an opportunity---the essential condition of successful talent---for displaying their legislative ability on a large scale, recommended them to a more extensive franchise at a more mature age; and again, when they, by caprice or want of money or otherwise were deprived of their larger seats, those close boroughs, which the noble Lord's bill would destroy altogether, received them, and secured their invaluable labours to their country. Such was the case when Mr. Sheridan was defeated at Stafford---he found shelter in Ilchester; Mr. Wyndham having failed at Norwich, took refuge at Higham Ferrers; Lord Castleregh, in like manner, having lost his election in the county of Down, was returned for Oxford; Mr. Tierney, when he lost Southwark, was returned for Knaresborough; and Lord Grey for Tavistock, when defeated in Northunberland. All this proved that the tendency, and notthe mere accident of the close borough system was to facilitate the entrance of men of ability who otherwise could not obtain a seat in that House.

Was this system, working so advantageously for the public weal---so fostering of talent and statesman-like ability—to be destroyed?

During a hundred and fifty years the constitution in its present form was in force, and he would ask any man who heard him to declare whether the experience of history had produced any form of government so calculated to promote the happines and secure the rights and liberties of a free and enightened people? (*Cheers.*) Many other experiments had been tried to ingraft democratical upon monarchical institutions, but how had they succeeded? In France, in Spain, in Portugal, in the Netherlands, n every country on the face of the earth, with the exception of the United States, had the experiment of brming a popular representative government, and of uniting it with monarchy, been tried; and how, he would again ask, had it succeeded? In America, the House had been told that the most beneficial effects of a representative form of government were plainly visible. But he begged to remind the House that there was a wide difference, indeed, between the circumtances of this country and of America. In the Unied States the constitution had not been in existence nore than forty years. It was not till the year 177[illegible] that the representative part of the American system of government had been established; and since that ime, many important changes, as every body knew, had been made respecting the mode of electing their President. As yet every thing was in uncertainty, for ever since the first establishment of the government of the United States it had been undergoing a change.

Sir Robert proceeded to comment upon the inutility of Reform, as a means of retrenchment and of preventing the influence of the Crown in the House.

We used to be told that retrenchment of the public expenditure would be the first measure of a reformed Parliament. But a reforming Government had declared already that all further retrenchment was impossible. We used also to be told that the influence of the Crown in that House was so enormous that a form was necessaary as a check upon it. The influence of the Crown in that House! Would [illegible] rise up in his place and state that any influence could contend successfully in that House with the influence of public opinion? (*Hear, hear,*) Persons were in the habit of saying that the Crown could now influence more members than at any former period of our history, and that the aristocracy could, by their support, establish or overthrow any government. Yes, gentlemen were in the babit of saying this, although since the death of Lord Liverpool, in 1827, the country had had five different prime Ministers, and five different administrations. (*Loud cheers.*) Such was the influence of the Crown---such was the influence of the Aristocracy! He contended that neither of these influences had any existence.

He deprecated the period at which the proposition was brought forward.

It was a period of great excitement, and if gentlemen would but give themselves the trouble of looking at the history of reform, they would find that it was always flourishing when there was either a pressure of great difficulty on the country, or some revolution on the Continent, which misled the people of England by the delusive hopes which it held out to them of the attainment of greater liberty than that which they then enjoyed. (*Cheers.*) Look at the question of Reform---look at the Parliamentary debates, and they would see that, whenever the question of Reform was frequentlv agitated, some dire misfortune lurked behind. It was brought forward with great pomp of circumstance in the year of the rebellion of 1745; it was brought prominently forward during the American war; it was brought forward at the commencement of the French war; and to come to our own times, it was brought prominently forward in the years 1817, 1819, and 1822,---in a word, at every period when there was either great commercial or great agricultural distress in the country. It was brought forward, too, at periods when the excitement of foreign revolutions misled the judgment of the British public, and deluding them with a false love of liberty, rendered them discontented with the moderate freedom which they enjoyed. Mr. Pitt was its advocate and champion in 1780, when the establishment of American independence, after a successful struggle with this country, had deluded the enthusiastic lovers of freedom in this country with notions of liberty which it was difficult to comprehend. From the year 1785 to the year 1790, the question of Reform slept in lethargy like that of the grave: but in the latter year the appalling events of the French Revolution again recalled it into life, and inspired it with new powers of existence. In the year 1821, when the question of Reform was brought forward by Lord Durham, he also appealed to the events which had just before taken place upon the Continent, and hailed them as the auspicious dawn of liberty upon this country. His language was---"Where its power and justice are acknowledged, as in Spain, the prospect is most cheering. We see disaffection instantaneously quelled---venerable and rotten abuses reformed---superstition eradicated---and the monarch and the people united under a constitution, which alike secures the privileges of the one. and the liberties of the other. May I not then consistently hail the rising of this star, in what was once the most gloomy portion of the European horizon, as a light to show us the way through all our dangers and difficulties---as a splended memorial of the all-conquering power of public opinion?" Was that star of liberty, he would ask, which then appeared in Spain, a steady light to show the people of England the way to an improved state of freedom, or was it the periodical return of an eccentric comet, which sheds disastrous light and perplexes nations with fear of change? (*Cheers.*) Again, with the events of the French revolution fresh in the recollection of the country, he had no hesitation in saying that the same experiment was again in agitation, and the country was again expecting that it could improve its own liberty from the example of what had recently passed in France.

Sir Robert Peel thus concluded his speech, which was admirably delivered, and made an extraordinary impresstion on the House——

"Oh! let us wait until we see more of the results of that experiment, for it is proper that we should pause before we make it in our own happy country. Let us feel assured, that the liberty, which now exists in France, if it be the offspring of a just revolution, is that liberty which has virtue and justice as its companions, and peace and prosperity for its attendants. I see at present no reasons for expecting to see such consequences from the late revolution in France; and I deprecate above all things making the revolution in France a precedent for a revolution in this country. Let us therefore remain content with the well-tempered freedom which we now enjoy, and which we have the means of securing, if we act with ordinary discretion. I lament exceedingly that Government should have determined to agitate such a question as that of Reform at this particular crisis: It would have been wiser in my opinion to have avoided these new causes of excitement, for depend upon it that by this process throughout this land the first seeds of discontent and disunion are sown (*Loud cheers from the Opposition.*) In every town there will be a conflict—a moral conflict, I mean—between the possessors of existing authority, and existing privileges, and those to whom the existing authority and the existing privileges are to be transferred. Oh! Sir, I lament beyond measure, that Government had not the prudence to adhere to that temperate course of policy which they have pursued elsewhere. I lament that, if they did think it necessary to propose a plan of reform in this excited state of the public mind, they did not confine it within those narrow limits which are consistent with the safety of the country and the dignity of their own characters. They have thought proper, however to adopt another course; they have sent through the land the firebrand of agitation; and it is easy so far to imitate the giant enemy of the Philistines, as to send three hundred firebrands through the country, carrying danger and dismay in all quarters; but it is not easy, when the mischief is done, to find a remedy for it. In the present difficulties of your situation, when you should have the powers of summoning all the energies of life, and should take care that you do not signalize your own destruction by blowing down the pillars of the edific of your liberty, which, with all its imperfection, still contains the noblest society of freemen known to the habitable world." (*Long continued cheering and calls for adjournment.*)

Mr. JOHN SMITH said. he happened to be one of those who had an interest in a borough, and he was perfectly couvinced that the power in his hands had been improperly placed. He had a right to say this, for he had possessed the power for twenty-nine years of putting a member into that House for the borough of Midhurst; and he could say that he never had received one single shilling from any person for his right, nor had it been of the slighest importance to him in point of self-interest nor in any respect, except that it enabled him to do what was delightful to him—that was, to put one or two Whigs into the House of Commons. Some parts of the present measure he entertained great difficultiea about, though, when he heard it, it had the effects of taking away his breath, so surprised and delighted was the (*Cheers.*) It could not be denied that there existed a great degree of anxiety among an immense number of people on the subject of Parliamentary Reform. It was not unreasonable that the people should demand Reform, when it was considered how much they suffered from the conduct of Parliament. They felt the weight of taxation, and attributed the burdens to the inconsiderate and extravagant proceedings of the Legislature. An independent and intelligent House of Commons would not have run into the last French war; and had any similar injudicious acts been avoided, there was not a man in the country but would have reaped advantage. He called upon the noble lord to preserve in his plan, and told him that the people of England were with him. (*Cheering from the Treasury bench es.*) Although the noble lord might no be the individual to succeed on this occasion, his scheme, or something like it, must be adopted.

Mr. CALCRAFT declared himself friendly to Reform and that he had come down to the House on Tuesday to support the Minister, but war prevented from doing so by the extravagance of their plans. He was ready to admit that some small boroughs ought to be cut off in order to furnish members for the large towns, but could not see why Wareham should be included in the number.

Mr, STANLEY ridicuied the notion that an act was revolutionary which was submitted to the Legislature in the regular and constitutional way. With respect to Wareham, he would only repeat what its zealous member had himself told him—his right honourable friend near him need not feel any alarm—he was not going to divulge any secrets. His honourable friend informed him, that on the occasion of his being chaired as one of the members for the borough of Wareham, he heard one elector saying to another, "Pray who is the new member?" "Why," answered the person interrogated, "Calcraft is one, and a friend of his is the other; but I never saw him before, and I don't know who he is." Doubtless any person recommended by his honourable friend would be highly respectable; but he was elected without being at all known by the voters. This was not much in favour of Wareham.

Mr. WYNN declared his hostility to the measure He knew what that declaration amounted to—it was a virtual resignation of the office he held (Secretary at war); but he conscientiously felt that he could not in this instance go along with his colleagues.

Mr. JEFFREY, the Lord Advocate, addressed the House. He began by assuming, from the general silence of the Scotch Members, that the part of the general measure which concerned Scotland was not disapproved by them. He should therefore apply his remarks to the great general topics which the debate presented.

"I think the topics on both sides that have been most frequently alluded to and most forcibly pressed on our attention, are, first, the undoubted prosperity of the people on both ends of the island at the present moment—a prosperity which the argument of any necessity for the present motion goes to impeach; secondly, the want of any showing of a direct evil in the situation of the people, or of any injury to their national interests, which can be directly traced to the state of the representation; and, thirdly of the want of any specification of the particular benefits which the changes now proposed are likely to confer on us. If I were disposed to be declamatory rather than attempt to be argumentative, I might perhaps, add to these the grievances which an honourable and learned member characterized so playfully and so fancifully as a corporation robbery, and that other graver and more serious charge put forward by an honourable Baronet, of a tendency to promote a revolution. I might, too, dwell on the insinuations that the ultimate consequences of these changes must be to remove the Crown from the brow of the Sovereign, and that Monarchy and all its branches and institutions will be speedily rooted out of this country I might enumerate among these the assertion, that no reason has been shown for these unprecedented changes; that the people themselves do not desire, and have not really called for them; and that although they are now exceedingly clamorous, and insist on the fulfilment of their wishes with menaces of force in the event of a refusal, still that all this clamour and all these menaces of force in the event of a refusal, still all this clamour and all these menaces were originally raised, and have been sedulously fostered. by those who are now pleading them as a justification of that measure which they are endeavouring to prevail on this House to adopt. I may be permitted to add finally, to all this, what has been put forth confidently both in and out of doors, that notwithstanding these manœuvres the present system of representation is at the bottom extremely popular with all whose opinions can be considered important, and that as the countryt prospered eminently, and attained the highest rank among nations with that representation, it would be rash and unwise to change what we possess for that which was less known, and may be less beneficial." (*Cheers.*)

Mr. Jeffrey went on to argue these points. He thus disposed of the latter.

"Looking back through the last two or three years, we are told, that under our present system we have gone on increasing in glory and in prosperity. Undoubtedly it is so. In the days of the Tudors and the Stuarts we were prosperous. Even then our wealth and splendour and high degree of cultivation began to distinguish us from the nations around; and I would add, too, that, compared with the other empires of Europe, we had even then made a very considerable progress in the attainment of domestic liberty. And if we had thus easily gained possession of a great extent of political liberty, and increasing wealth and opulence, might it not have been an argument against the prudence of those who lived under the Tudors and the Stuarts, that they should have rested satisfied with the liberty and the opulence they already possessed, and that they ought not to have struggled for more, because they endangered the safety of that which they had already achieved? (*Hear!*) This, in truth, is the argument which is now put forward against us. In order to attain a very great measure of public and national prosperity, a very little degree of political freedom is found necessary. Every despot who, either from a regard for his own interests, or from indifference or easiness of temper, may allow a limited degree of political freedom to his people, gives an encouragement to industry and enterprise? from that arise manufactures and commerce. The result of this is the growth of ease, wealth, and opulence, and the fruit of the tree is liberty. Under that moderate protection which even a tyrant may, for the sake of his interests, give the honey bees, they obtain wealth. In the language of the Son of Sirach, who seems, in his Ecclesiasticus, to have been a commentator on the beauties of the English Constitution, they attend to handicraft; but when their industry has given wealth, they demand liberty, which is the daughter, and not the mother of prosperity. Thus rose the Italian Republics—thus rose the free German towns—thus rose the cities of Flanders—thus rose the seeds of our own towns and guilds, which, under the power of accumulated wealth, obtained that municipal and civil freedom which formed the groundwork of our present liberties. It required little consideration to understand that of which all history gives us testimoney—that as the accumulatio of wealth leads to the desire of freedom for protection and enjoyment, so the multiplication of that wealth, of the channels through which it flows, and of the hands which possess it—the very distresses, in truth, which accompany the possession of our capital and of the means of employing it, demand greater extensions of liberty and an increase of the number of those to whom the regulation of public affairs is intrusted, and who ought to be found acquainted with the peculiar wants and interests of all the departments into which society is then divided. It must then follow, I think, as an absolute necessity for governing safely and wisely, that as long s nations continue to make progressions in wealth and civilzation, the political institutions to which they are subjected must be adapted to the change of circumstances in proposition as their interests demand the attention of men who are capable of accomodating themselves to the business of the State and increasing difficulties of society.

What, accordingly, has been the progress of the political institutions of England?

"All knew that the greater portion of property commenced under the concessions made by the Barons to their serfs; and that, as their serfs became rich and free, they either extorted rights from the Barons, or received characters and privileges in towns from the Sovereign, who, cunningly for his own day' but unwisely for his successors, granted these privileges to counteract the influence of his rebellious Nobles. Thus rose the Corporations, then the Burghs, and following them gradually, but surely, all the liberties and immunities we now enjoy. And what is the consequence? Why that at this moment the great mass of the population of this country possess a quantity of mind, a capacity of understanding, and an extent of information that enablec them to trample under foot the sophistries with which princes were deluded some two hundred years ago, and to make a matter of ridicule of the absurdities and superastitious which were then delivered from the pulpits."

But then it was said, that we should stop were we are because we now enjoy such a high pitch of prosperity. But who was to be the judge of the standard of improvement? Mr Jeffrey knew of no limits to the progress of improvement, or to the continually increasing desires of intelligent men, save the absence of reason in the arguments by which the craving of their desires are to be supported.

Now what is the fact here?---for I apprehend that we are, in this case, to determine more from facts than arguments. Let us suppose that there is no other boon demanded from us, at the present moment, than that we should admit to a share of privileges of the representation of the wealthy, the intelligent, and the middle classes of the country; those who are at Leeds and Manchester, and in a large portion of the metropolis itself, wholly excluded from the right of returning members to Parliament. Is it true, then, I ask, that those persons are discontented, dissatisfied, and soured, from being placed under an exclusion, and from being deprived of a right which they see exercised elsewhere [illegible]ers placed in a much humbler [illegible] (*Cheers mixed with cries of 'No!'*) You say no. I ask, what are we to say to the innumerable petitions on the table of the House? Petitions coming by hundreds and thousands, not from the middle or the lower classes, but from the merchants, and the lawyers, and men moving in the most elevated circles in the country. If this be the case, and if these petitions be as numerous as I understand they are, how is it we have not one to the contrary? No external document has yet appeared on the table of this House to give evidence of the existence of these feelings, with the exception of that petition from Bristol which contained an argument on the subject that might be expressed somewhat in the language of the dissenting barons of old, that they were unwilling the laws of England should be changed." *Cheers and laughter.*)

with respect to the franchise—

Can it be said that any bad effects would arise from giving representatives to Manchester, Leeds, and Sheffield; or that any injury would be inflicted on property, or any pernicious consequences flow to the other classes of society, if the large counties, each of which might be divided into sections equal to some of those of the ordinary size, were permitted to return members for each section? How could this demoralize the people, or injure the power of the Throne and the Aristocracy! But then it was contended that the franchise was merely the consequence of some providential kind of luck in those towns which had formerly emerged from insignificance—that it was necessary now to continue the franchise to those towns, although they had fallen into a state of decay, because it produced a happy commingling of the middle classes with the people of property and the aristocracy, and that, if the system was changed, the people of property and the aristocracy would be wholly excluded from their share in the representation. Sir, I am not bound to say that the union of interests is defeated by the means which are taken to preserve it; but I ask how the system answers at present, and how it is possible to agree with the arguments founded on those high-strained hypothetical grounds, which interest has dragged in to favour its views, but which it is utterly impossible to feel thoroughly borne out by the facts?

It was contended that it was a good thing to continue the connexion of the Peers with that House, lest they should be driven to exercise their naked influence to a dangerous extent in the affairs of the country. Now, it happened that the Lords, fortunately for themselves, had in England no voice or power except as hereditary possessors of property. Their political influence was of the most limited kind, except they were able to exercise it by the management of a part of the members of the House of Commons, In every other point of view, they are merely rich proprietors, possessing no higher political advantages than other men of property; and therefore, the idea of the danger to be apprehended from a disunion of interests wholly fails when it is subjected to examination. (*Cheers.*)

Then it was said that the Aristocracy of wealth generally should have its connexion with the House supported---

"I would say so also. I would allow property a large and liberal influence in elections; but I am prepared to contend that the present system, so far from giving that influence, produces much less than it will possess if this measure is carried into full effect. The member for Callington, indeed, admitted this himself, when, in alluding to the Parlia